

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

126729

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

---

*VOLUME IX—1903.*

---

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,  
LANCASTER, PA., AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

Ca

vo

PRINTED BY  
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY  
LANCASTER, PA.



# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*VOL. IX.*

*JANUARY, 1903.*

*No. 1.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

---

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,  
LANCASTER, PA., AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRESS OF  
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY,  
LANCASTER, PA.

# Cat

*Vol. 1*

To  
tem is  
history  
the qu  
reader  
try, is  
societi  
magni  
the me  
disting  
develo  
allowe

No  
Mgr. M  
mation  
is due  
perusa  
good i  
pied w  
enviro  
was se  
as a l  
Natur  
ternal  
For th

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. IX.*

---

*January, 1903.*

---

*No. 1.*

## THE OLD ENGLISH CHANTRY.

To the general student of English history the chantry system is a subject quite unfamiliar. Even to those who make the history of the English medieval church a special object of study the question is, as a rule, but little known; while to the casual reader of English life in past ages the very word itself, chantry, is new and insignificant. The guilds, those great benefit-societies of the Middle Ages, the Lollardy movement, and those magnificent "agricultural, industrial and literary republics," the monasteries, have all attracted to themselves a number of distinguished writers, who have set forth in detail their rise, development, influence and decline. But the chantry has been allowed to remain in obscurity.

Now why this neglect of an institution which, according to Mgr. Moyes, is among the most notable features in pre-Reformation England? The little attention given to it in early days is due, no doubt, to the character of most history writing. A perusal of the histories of Gibbon or Macaulay or Hume gives a good idea of the old style. These men seem to have been occupied with what are called the great questions—with the life and environment of kings and heroes and eminent men. All else was set aside as unworthy of attention or was considered merely as a background for the great life or event to be depicted. Naturally in the works of such men a subject so devoid of external glamor as the chantry is, could have but little place. For there is nothing in it to tempt the writer of high-sounding

periods, no glowing scenes to be described, no achievements calculated to arouse popular enthusiasm.

But how does it happen that in these latter days, at a time when historians seek to give us a glimpse of the life of the great mass of the people—as they bought and sold, joyed and sorrowed, labored and suffered and prayed—how is it, I ask, that in such works a paragraph usually sums up all that is worth saying on the subject? This question indeed is not so easy to answer. It may be remarked however that most of the writers who have occupied themselves with that period of English history are men of an immeasurably different religious spirit from the people of the time of which they speak, men who, in their writings, may have been animated with an “objective sense of justice,” but who have lacked the sympathy necessary for a right understanding of the life and customs of the Catholics of pre-Reformation days. Without this sympathy, without a belief in the existence of purgatory, without an ability to enter into the intense religious life of the people, a life in which the things of faith were realized as clearly as “the merchant now realizes the market place and his bales of merchandise,” it is very difficult to rightly understand a religious institution of the chantry character. Then again, it is to be noted that materials bearing on the question of the chantry are not so abundant as is desirable. True the archives of the British Museum, and the parish churches and cathedrals scattered throughout the kingdom, are rich in these data, but as yet only a comparatively small part of them has been printed or even calendered. This valuable work is now under way. But because of the many difficulties which beset such a task, and because of the small number of men capable of properly performing it, its progress is slow.

By what has been just said, however, I would not be understood as implying that our present materials are so inadequate as to prevent the student from securing a fairly accurate notion of the chantry system. Such an impression would be erroneous. Thanks to the publications of the different English historical and archaeological societies—of the Surtees Society, the Chetham Society, the Somerset Society, the Yorkshire Archaeological Society and many others—and to the learned intro-

ducti  
schol  
wills,  
thus  
first  
condi  
futura  
serve  
pictu  
furni  
the c

Br  
ment  
certai  
found  
or few  
tial, a  
the so  
a fun  
the p  
churc

It  
ligiou  
which  
eterna  
only i  
From  
or cor  
part a  
from  
quiet  
villag  
erous  
those  
and li

<sup>1</sup> Th  
4-5 Ch  
chawnt  
chauntr  
M. L. C

ductions written to the different publications by eminent scholars, much light has been thrown on the question. The wills, church-warden accounts and commissioners' reports, thus far published, though by no means complete, give us at first hand an interesting picture of the social and religious condition of the people of those days. And although the future labors of these different learned societies will, no doubt, serve to bring out in clearer light the different details of this picture, already, in accuracy and color, they are such as to furnish us with no faint notion of the nature and influence of the chantry institution.

Briefly, a chantry<sup>1</sup> as it existed in England, was the endowment of one or more priests, charged with the performance of certain duties, usually, though not necessarily, set down by the founder in a deed of foundation. These duties might be many or few according to the will of the testator. One only was essential, and that one was the office of reading or singing mass for the soul of the donor, or for the souls of persons named by him, a function which was performed in a chapel built specially for the purpose, or at an altar already existing in some parish church or cathedral.

It is clear from this definition that the chantry was a religious institution, primarily though not solely—a means which persons took to insure, in so far as they were able, the eternal welfare of their souls. But the chantry was not the only institution erected with a view to this spiritual benefit. From early mediæval times nobles and rich gentry had founded or contributed to the foundation of monasteries, animated, in part at least, by the thought of the eternal favors to be derived from the prayers of those who had been assisted. Built in the quiet depths of the primeval forest, or in the very heart of villages and towns, raised and supported in answer to the generous promptings of hearts overflowing with religious interests, those homes of prayer, industry, and agriculture, art, science and literature, carried on for centuries their glorious work of

<sup>1</sup> The different forms of the word chantry as found in Murray's Dictionary are: 4-5 Chanterie; 4-6 try; 5 chaunterye; 5-6 Chauntery-e; 6 chauntrie, trye, chawntary, chanterie (schawittry, schawnter); 6-7 chauntry; 7 chantrie; 5-9 chauntrig; 5 chantry (M. E. Chaunterie; O. F. chanterie; F. chanter—to sing; M. L. Cantaria, cantuaria, whence cantarie, cantuarie).

building up the solid structure of England's power and greatness.

But there came a time in the course of events when religious fervor and zeal ceased to find their expression in the monastic establishment. After the year 1350 we search the records in vain for traces of this form of endowment. At about that period the social and religious condition of the English people underwent a tremendous change. The transformation was mainly brought about by a series of overwhelming calamities which fell upon England, in common with the rest of Europe, in the middle of the fourteenth century. The first one, known as the Black Death, so called from the dark blotches which appeared on the skin of the person afflicted, was by far the most terrible. It first made its appearance in the ports of Bristol and Southampton in August, 1348, and thence its deadly breath was quickly wafted all over the land. Blackened and disfigured corpses to the number of one half the population made the island one vast charnel house.

The effects of this and the two succeeding plagues in the religious world were of the nature of a revolution. At first a dull despair fastened itself upon all; and writers of the period agree in their descriptions of the dissoluteness and corruption which for a time prevailed. But such a deplorable condition of affairs could not long exist in a nation in whose heart the fires of faith had for centuries so brightly burned. A great religious awakening soon took place. A new religious spirit seems suddenly to have grown up among the people, a spirit marked by its devotional and self-reflective character and finding its expression in a number of religious practices hitherto but indifferently popular.

Among these, the devotion to the souls in purgatory, a devotion old and dear to Catholic hearts, had a special attraction. And this is not to be wondered at. For the pre-Reformation English were a deeply religious people. Religion indeed was the sunlight of their lives, the very soul of their commonest daily duties. The doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church had taken a firm hold on the minds and hearts of all. Her Christian ideals, her teaching on the Christian brotherhood of man, her doctrines on the efficacy of prayer and good works

for sa  
the ve  
fore, c  
its dre  
intens  
to the  
spared  
to sec  
plagu  
holy s  
many  
of cha  
its ris  
the C  
throug  
of the  
did th  
lence  
souls.  
tion o  
and t  
ment,  
exerci  
been l  
"as il  
for th  
author  
impor

Co  
which  
inscri  
remer  
statue  
ing le  
ment  
we ar  
chant  
many  
durin

for salvation and on the communion of saints were, in reality, the very cornerstone of their whole social fabric. It was, therefore, only natural, when the "awful cruelty of death" had left its dreaded trace on every side, that the nation should turn with intense ardor to the church's consoling teaching with regard to the holy souls—that those whom the "fell mortality" had spared should strive with the means which the church held out, to secure the eternal rest of the souls of the dear ones whom the plague had taken away. Now this increased devotion to the holy souls, following on the plagues, found its expression in many ways but in none more markedly than in the foundation of chantries. The chantry foundation did not of course take its rise at that time. Long before the Black Death, even before the Conquest, traces of the chantry are discernible, while throughout the thirteenth and especially during the first half of the fourteenth centuries large numbers were erected. Nor did the chantries founded after the passage of the great pestilence spring up solely in answer to the devotion to the holy souls. Indeed after the plagues, owing to more equal distribution of wealth, to the growing importance of the middle class and to the decrease in popularity of the monastic establishment, motives of a less spiritual character may be said to have exercised a stronger influence than ever before. This fact has been lost sight of by many men who have regarded chantries "as illustrative of the extent to which the necessity of praying for the dead was impressed upon the people, by ecclesiastical authorities and that with a view to their own profit," yet it is important for a just appreciation of the institution.

Conspicuous among these other motives was "that pride which hopes still to exact homage in its ashes and to live in an inscription." For just as in ancient times the desire to be remembered found expression in the stately arch, the graceful statue or the animated bust, and just as to-day this same craving leads to the foundation of universities and the establishment of libraries, so in the days of faith and piety of which we are speaking it moved men to choose as fitting memorial the chantry and its priest; and though there can be no doubt that many of these chantries were erected for this end by men who during life had done no deed worthy of the grateful memory of



posterity yet, at the same time, it is equally certain that not a few of them were raised by a loving and admiring people and stood as monuments, meant to be perpetual, to "the best and holiest and most venerated names in the long roll of English men of honor."

Again, in a large number of instances, the chantry speaks the ardent desire of zealous souls to increase God's earthly glory by adding to the number of ministers in the cathedrals and parish churches. In our day when so many causes have tended to weaken the delicate spiritual sense it is difficult to realize the religious fervor of souls in an age when men lived in the divine presence, when men remembered God, sought God and saw God everywhere. A cold, barren religious service, such as the Reformation has forced upon the world, could not satisfy the cravings of the hearts of such a people. The most magnificent churches, the most sumptuous furniture, the most artistic decorations, the most solemn ceremonies, the most gorgeous vestments, a numerous and complex staff of endowed ministers, all that goes to arouse the imagination and to inflame the heart, were deemed essential; and no expense was spared, no labor was thought excessive, which would lead to their possession. In response to religious promptings such as these, we are not surprised to find that many a chantry was founded that the priest thereof might, "syng in the quyer and help in the doyns of all divine service," or "to the praise of God, and in honor of the Saviour and the name of Jesus and also that divine service might be increased and augmented."<sup>2</sup>

Then again many chantries were erected by pious founders as a means of fulfilling actual social and religious needs. Thus it was that the demand for grammar schools led many to establish chantry foundations which took on the educational aspect; thus it was that the wretched condition of the jails, where men were "caged like dogs and fed like hogs," caused persons of ardent faith and munificent charity to erect chantries that the "prysoners of the gaole" might have the aid and consolations of the priest; thus it was that the

<sup>2</sup> These chantries were erected in the county palatine of Lancaster and are dated 1506. This is probably the most common reason assigned by Edward the Sixth's commissioners for the existence of chantries.

pitiful  
the a  
the h  
mater  
the m  
religi  
paris  
ease;  
a dev  
souls  
at th  
pier  
must  
Inde  
stren

S  
the g  
were  
had n  
castl  
foun  
gatio  
of w  
pesti  
same  
pries  
felt t  
neces  
many  
had c

Archæ  
the br  
much

of a  
Brant  
Paul's  
chapel  
tain a  
church  
none  
pende  
wife,



pitiful condition of the sick and the destitute, the feeble and the aged induced generous benefactors to erect chantries in the hospitals that the inmates might have the ministrations, material as well as spiritual, of the incumbent; so it was that the many cases of death without the last sacraments impelled religious souls to found chantries in places distant from the parish church thus giving them the character of chapels of ease; thus it was that the needs of those making pilgrimages, a devotion very popular in pre-reformation days, led devout souls to erect wayside chapels. Many of these last were erected at the entrance to bridges, or more frequently on the central pier of the bridge, and a welcome sight to the weary pilgrim must have been the lone lamp just mitigating the chapel gloom. Indeed few there were in those days who entered not to seek strength and consolation on the way.<sup>3</sup>

Still another fruitful source of chantry foundations was the great demand for domestic chapels. These domestic chapels were nothing new in English life. For centuries noble families had maintained priests who celebrated religious services in the castles or manor houses—an arrangement which excused the founders, except on rare and specified occasions, from the obligation of attending the parish church. Now with the increase of wealth of the middle class, for which the century after the pestilences was conspicuous, many rich yeomen coveted these same privileges. Besides, a domestic chapel with a resident priest brought to a household a certain dignity which those who felt themselves able were not slow to seek. But the conditions necessary for the erection of a regular domestic chapel were many and serious; so to escape these difficulties many families had chapels built under the convenient form of the chantry.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> A very fine example of such a bridge chapel is seen in the *Journal of Archæological Association*, 1864, by F. R. Wilson where is described the chapel on the bridge over the Calder, at Wakefield, in Yorkshire, on the road between the much frequented abbeys and shrines.

<sup>4</sup> Here is an example of the foundation of a domestic chapel under the guise of a chantry, taken from Cutts "Parish Priests, etc.," p. 724. "Sir G. de Brante, in right of Joanne his wife, had liberty given him by Robert dean of St. Paul's, with the consent of Walter Niger, Vicar of Navestock, Essex, to found a chapel and chantry in his court at Navestock, provided he and his heirs maintain a chaplain at his own expense, sworn to preserve the liberty of the mother church, and to pay the vicar all the profits he should receive there, and admit none of the parishioners to confession or other offices under pain of being suspended by the bishop. The founder also and the heirs of the said Joanne his wife, and whoever else had the said chapel in his lordship, were also to be sworn

From the number and variety of the motives leading to the foundation of chantries we may readily understand that the movement was widespread. Thus we find archbishops, bishops, canons, deans and vicars choral, even the chantry priests themselves, when able, all making provision for the chantry establishment. But the movement was by no means confined to the clerical body. Among the laity it was equally popular. The successful merchant whose business ability and growing wealth made his name a household word with the people of the town in which he lived; the knight whose deeds of valor were the subject of praise throughout the land; the noble, whose impregnable castle dominated from some summit the poor wattle huts of the villagers; the very kings of the realm, not even excluding Henry VIII himself, willed that chantries should be erected in their honor and for the good of their souls. And where an individual was unable of himself to secure the much-desired object he united with others for the purpose.<sup>5</sup> Indeed most of the guilds that arose during this period were associations formed mainly in view of the chantry establishment and deserve the name, given them by a recent writer, of "coöperative chantries."<sup>6</sup> Thus high and low, rich and poor throughout the length and breadth of the land were directly or indirectly occupied in the erection and maintenance of these foundations.

As a result of this universal interest we find that in 1547 when Edward VI ordered their suppression, there were, according to Peter Heylin in his "*Ecclesiastica Restaurata*," no less than 2,347 of them. Nor is this estimate by any means over the

to preserve the rights of the mother church under like pain. In which chapel the chaplain was to administer the mass only, with bread and holy water (sic) forbearing all other holy offices, saving that at Easter the founder and his wife and heirs, together with her free servants and guests, were to be admitted to the sacrament of the altar; but all his servants were to go to the mother church throughout the year.

<sup>5</sup>E. g., "The chauntre of Donatyve at Saynt James auter in the church of Yycall. John Clowdesdale, incumbent. The sayd chauntre is founded by the inhabitants ther of ther devocion to pray for the prosperity of parochiniers and all crysten sowles, and to kepe the quier in the sayd church at all devyne servyce, & the landes gyven to the sayd chauntre by severall persons of the parochiniers ther. The same chauntre is in the sayd church. The necessete is to helpe the curate to mynyster sacramentes to the parochyans, ther beyng in number of c c c howslynge people and above." Extract from commissioners' reports for Yorkshire. Page, William: "*Yorkshire Chantry Surveys*," 2 vols., London, 1898; Vol. I, p. 58.

<sup>6</sup>See Ashley, "*Eng. Econ. Hist.*," Vol. II, pp. 37, 38 seq.

mark. To the contrary, we have every reason to believe that when all the certificates and records scattered throughout England are printed, we shall find the total number of the chantries somewhat larger than Heylin's calculation. The records thus far published however show us that the distribution of the chantries throughout the land was unequal. We learn for example that in Yorkshire, one of the richest and most populous districts in England, there were 402 such foundations, while, according to the publications of the Chetham Society, the Commissioners of Edward VI report only ninety for the poor and sparsely inhabited county of Lancaster.<sup>7</sup> Again in towns with cathedrals served by secular canons we find that chantries existed, as a rule, in large numbers,<sup>8</sup> whereas only a few are given for places where monks were in charge.<sup>9</sup>

As to the location of the chantry chapels there was nothing defined. We have a great many examples of them standing as detached buildings in out of the way places or in churchyards or in cloister courts. Chantries of this kind were sometimes of two stories, the lower one being devoted to the strictly religious services of the foundation, while the incumbent used the upper floor as his home or as a school room. But in most cases the chantry chapel was a part of the parish church or cathedral. Sometimes it was an addition made to the choir and opening into it, while at other times it was made by screening off a space between the great pillars of the nave or transept. This latter method seems to have been the most popular. In such a case the altar was erected usually under a window with a lavatory adjoining. Room was left for the priest to celebrate and an acolyte to serve, while those who attended the service stood or knelt outside.

At times the number of these foundations in parish churches was so large that the church was absorbed, as it were, and became what was called a chantry college, or collegiate church. By this it is not meant that the church became an educational institution. True, some did take on this character. But ordi-

<sup>7</sup> In these reports we must remember that many chantries had been concealed by the owners and by the priests and were not published in the Commissioners' lists.

<sup>8</sup> St. Paul's, London, had 54 at the time of the suppression.

<sup>9</sup> Durham, Ely, Norwich, Worcester, Winchester, had none. See Cutts, "Parish Priests," p. 443.

narily by collegiate church is simply meant an association of chantry priests living together under the same roof and having one of their number called warden or dean, for superior. By this change of the aspect of the parish church, parochial duties were not neglected. On the contrary, with the dean as rector and the cure of souls discharged by one or more of the chantry priests acting in the capacity of vicars, the religious affairs had the very best of attention. These collegiate institutions were not at all uncommon in England, and in wealth, number of clergy, dignity of worship they may be said to have occupied a second or middle rank between the ordinary parochial churches on the one hand and the cathedral churches on the other.

In the great majority of cases the interior decoration of the chantry chapel was meagre, the donors seeming to have been able only to supply them with the bare necessities—with a vestment, a missal, cruets, bell, chalice, a paten and linens. At the same time there also existed a large number of noble specimens of architectural design. In such the stained glass window behind the altar was of exquisite workmanship, setting forth in brilliant and beautifully harmonized colors some subject of popular devotion or, in case of a guild chapel, the figure of the saint under whose patronage the association was founded. The altar, made of stone, was artistically carved, so as to set forth the different mysteries of the faith. Resting on it was a tablet bearing in large characters the name of the founder that all the worshippers might remember him in their prayers. Beautiful frescoes or rare and costly tapestries covered the walls, while the wooden screens which separated the chapel from the body of the church were of exquisite design and perfect workmanship. The roof too received attention. As a rule it was divided into a series of panels, each panel bearing the motto or monogram of the founder surrounded by delicately executed foliage whose serrated edges appeared as if the breath of woods had blown through them. Thus did these chapels become a no slight means of teaching the unlettered the mysteries of the faith.

But the most remarkable thing about these beautiful gems of art is that, as in the case of the great cathedrals, churches and castles of the Middle Ages, the designers and workmen

are  
bea  
dece  
from  
spe  
stan  
trut  
in a  
nec  
goo  
plis  
tion  
whe  
is d  
exce  
asen  
villa  
you  
ther  
cent  
such  
time  
a ru  
men  
tica  
fore  
buil  
p. 16  
chest  
of G  
man  
p. 11  
still  
corat  
from  
"Wil  
Edm  
'ymn  
north  
and  
I dec

are unknown. It seems hard to account for the fact that the beauty, genius and invention discovered in their structure and decoration should not have rescued the names of their builders from the oblivion in which they lie. But what Rogers says, in speaking of the Middle Age cathedral, may help us to understand this condition of affairs, for his remarks apply with equal truth to the chantries. "It seems," he says,<sup>10</sup> "that skill in architecture and intimate acquaintance with all that was necessary, not only for the design of the structure but also for good workmanship and endurance, was so common an accomplishment that no one was at pains to proclaim his own reputation or to record the reputation of another." And occasionally, when by accident, the author of some rarely beautiful specimen is discovered, the world is astonished to learn that a work so excellent in design and so perfect in execution as to have been ascribed to some great master<sup>11</sup> is from the hand of a simple village workman (at times even the very donor himself)<sup>12</sup> "a youth to fortune and to fame unknown."

But as we look about us now and see only vestiges here and there of these many expressions of the ardent faith and munificent charity of that by-gone time we are very apt to consider all such lavish ornamentation and exquisite detail as a waste of time and labor and wealth. Let us not forget, however, that as a rule the more beautiful chantries were meant to be perpetual memorials. By this I do not wish to imply that only the artistically decorated chapels were destined by the donors to last forever. Many of the most meagerly furnished chantries were built with this intention. As regards their existence, indeed,

<sup>10</sup> Rogers, R. E. T.: "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," London, 1890, p. 162.

<sup>11</sup> A remarkable series of paintings on the walls of the Lady Chapel at Winchester long thought to be the work of some unknown Italian artist of the school of Giotto has been found by Wm. J. Clarke, to have been executed by an English man named Baker. Gasquet, F. A.: "Eve of the Reformation," London, 1900, p. 11.

<sup>12</sup> The chantry of John Baret, in the Church of St. Mary's Bury St. Edmunds, still quite well preserved and forming a most interesting remnant of church decoration, was very probably the work of John Baret himself. Here is an extract from the will of John Bawde of Woolpett dated 1501 and found on p. 83 of "Wills and Inventories from the Registers of the Commissary of the Bury St. Edmunds," etc. (1370-1650) (Camden Society), London, 1850, by Samuel Tymms. "I wyll that the tabernacle of St. James, weche I did make in the north yle and the troues of the auter there by, be well and sufficiently peynted and a cloth bought to save the seyde tabernacle fro soyle; also the stooles weche I ded make, coloured and garnysched wt synnys of Seynt Jamys."



chantries were of two kinds, those meant to be perpetual and those which, according to the will of foundation, were meant only to last for a stated number of years. Most of those erected in perpetuity did in fact exist till the statute of suppression was passed, although some of them, either because of insufficiency of revenue or because of the inability of one of the parties to carry out the conditions of the foundation, fell into decay, the altar being abandoned or sometimes even actually removed. Chantries to which this happened, as well as those which were explicitly founded for a certain number of years, greatly added to the number of what were called migratory priests—clerics who wandered about from place to place seeking fields of labor, thus becoming the source of most of the evils that can be placed at the door of the chantry system.

According to Canon Law chantries were of three kinds, mercenary, collative, and in private patronage. In the erection of the mercenary form the bishop played no part, the funds set aside by the donor never becoming ecclesiastical but always remaining in the hands of the founder or his trustees. By their institution no title was conferred. The priest was chosen by the owner to say mass and could be removed at the owner's will. Having no permanent endowment these priests were ordained by the bishop on proof that they were entitled to a small pension with which they declared themselves to be satisfied. History shows however that frequently they became dissatisfied and at times demanded for their services sums that were considered excessive. Chantries erected for a certain number of years and those depending for their maintenance on voluntary offerings of many persons were no doubt of this mercenary character. But this was by no means the more common form of foundation. The canon law of Rome as Maitland clearly proves was binding throughout England,<sup>13</sup> and the unceasing effort of the canon law would be toward making all these foundations ecclesiastical. Besides as Moyes points out,<sup>14</sup> we know from the use of the words "Post admis-

<sup>13</sup> This Maitland does in his admirable series of essays entitled "Roman Canon Law in the Church of England," London, 1898. Cf. CATH. UNIV. BUL., 1901, Vol. VII, p. 347.

<sup>14</sup> J. Moyes, in the "Academy," Vol. 37, p. 223.

sion  
Glos  
right  
form  
feren  
of th  
him.  
in p  
poli  
heir  
this  
said  
tutio  
" T  
quir  
ever  
and  
cien  
bish  
crow  
was  
unle  
knig  
the  
rect  
also  
sible  
sho  
inde  
mak  
go v  
char  
held  
obs  
prie  
out

cedat  
univ  
integ

sionem" used in the constitution of Winchelsey and in the Gloss of Lyndwood, that the collative chantries or chantries by right of patronage were the common forms. In both of these forms the chantry was instituted by the bishops, the only difference being that in the latter form the right of presentation of the incumbent belonged to the founder or those named by him. It would seem however that of these two forms, chantries in private patronage was the more common, for it was the policy of chantry founders to keep to themselves or to their heirs the right of presenting the priest. But of course even in this case, in accordance with the canon law, which as we have said was recognized as of binding authority in England, institution by the bishop was necessary.

To erect these chantries conditions analogous to those required in the building of a church had to be fulfilled. Before everything else the permission of the ordinary was necessary, and this was given only when he was satisfied that funds sufficient for the erection and maintenance were laid aside. The bishop's consent obtained the founder then applied to the crown for license to alienate lands in mortmain. This license was not to be obtained without very special royal permission unless the lands were held by other than soccage tenure, or knight's service. But besides the permission of the bishop and the license of the crown it appears that the permission of the rector of the parish in which the chantry was to be raised had also to be obtained. At any rate it is certain that every possible care was taken that the vested rights of the mother church should not be allowed to be invaded.<sup>15</sup> In a number of instances indeed the incumbent as an evidence of his subjection had to make an oath of obedience to the rector. By law he had to go with those who had permission to attend the services of his chantry, to take part in certain processions and ceremonies held during the year in the parochial church, a regulation, be it observed, which at times was neglected. Again, the chantry priest could receive no tithes or Easter dues; nor could he, without special permission of the ordinary, administer the sacra-

<sup>15</sup> *Capellæ cum fuerint constructæ nihil in eis fiat quod in matricis ecclesiæ cedat præjudicium . . . statuimus ut sacerdotes in dictis capellis ministrantes universas oblationes quas in ipsis offerri contigerit, ecclesiæ matricis rectori cum integritate restituant.* Wilkins, "Concilia," Vol. II, p. 137.

ments or perform any other of the duties usually belonging to a priest with a cure of souls.<sup>16</sup> From this it will be seen that the incumbents of the collative chantries or chantries in private patronage had only simple benefices; though at times as, for example, in cases of collegiate bodies and many outlying districts, benefices with cures existed.

Once the rights of the parish priest were secured, there still remained, in a large number of cases at least, other formalities to be carried out in the erection of the chantry. There was the legal institution by the civil authorities of the place where the chantry was founded. "Compositions," i. e., bonds or agreements establishing the various chantries with their particular rules were enrolled in the city books, and in Bristol we are told that "it hath been used on the iiiii daie after Mighelmas, the newe maire to bet summen all the chauntry priests whose composicions are enrolled in the rede boke to com before the maire to the counter, their to take their othes truly to observe their seide composicions."<sup>17</sup>

These "composicions" or regulations were the work of the donor of the chantry and were contained in the deed of foundation. In framing them the founder was free to command those things which seemed good to him so that he should lay down nothing out of harmony with the conciliar and synodal decrees, relative to the duties of a priest, duties of a patron, the rights of the parish rector and the like. Regulations made contrary to such decrees, duties and rights were to be considered by the bishop when instituting the chantry as null and void. To see the wisdom of these precautions one has only to read the wills of the period, which are filled with the most curious stipulations in violation of the church law. But, once the regulations were properly drawn up and were accepted by the bishop, the will of the founder was strictly binding even to details.

As one reads these different regulations he is impressed with the great care manifested in regard even to minute particulars. Everything is considered and provided for—the

<sup>16</sup> *Inhibemus etiam ne in capellis quæ proprios parochos non habent, parochianis matricis ecclesiæ, nec aliis quibuscunque sacramenta vel sacramentalia ministrantur, nisi aliquibus amplius fuit indultum.* Wilkins, "Concilia," Vol. II, p. 137.

<sup>17</sup> Ashley, W. J.: "An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory," 2 vols., London, 1888-93; Vol. II, p. 42.

metho  
oath o  
be cho  
stock  
doles,  
and re  
these  
from  
was n  
one pr  
to mal  
regard  
and b  
affecti  
are se  
sixteen

Le

In acc

"H  
south  
to pray  
Urswick  
benefice  
"Dirige  
the peop  
horting  
should t  
etc.," fo  
same Is  
uted to  
The cha  
in the c  
vespers,  
as the r  
more th  
should  
mas, an  
the sum  
M. after  
B. V. M  
books,  
incontin  
loss of  
Quoted  
XI, vol  
article  
foundat  
lay Cha  
minute

<sup>18</sup> A  
to 37 s

2cu



method to be followed in choosing the priest and in giving the oath of office, the number of incumbents, if more than one is to be chosen, his duties and place of living, the disposition of the stock and stores, living and dead, the amount to be given in doles, and in salary, the provision for the proper decoration and repair.<sup>18</sup> It sometimes occurred however notwithstanding these carefully prepared regulations that the chantry revenue from one cause or other became insufficient. In such cases it was not unusual to unite two or even three foundations under one priest,<sup>19</sup> or for some relative of the founder to come forward to make up the deficit. Especially is this last act true with regard to supplying the chantry chapel with bell, vestments and books, and many touching instances of the piety and affection of the people of the times manifested in this way are seen in the wills of the fourteenth, fifteenth and early sixteenth century.

Let us now turn our attention to the chantry priest. In acquiring a knowledge of this life and character we shall

<sup>18</sup> Here is a foundation charter for a chantry at the altar of St. Anne in the south arch of the church of Blessed Mary of Badsworth. It was founded in 1510 to pray for the soul of Isabella, wife of William Vavasour and daughter of Robert Urswick. The charter ordains that a chaplain of secular habit, not otherwise beneficed, should celebrate a requiem mass every week, and also a "Placebo" and "Dirige," according to the use in the cathedral church at York, he should turn to the people at the first (sic) lavatory in every mass and say "De Profundis" exhorting the people standing round to pray for the soul of the founder, and he should then say the collect (sic) "Incline Domine auram tuam ad preces nostras, etc.," for the same souls. And every year there should be an anniversary for the same Isabelle, on Tuesday after the octave of Easter, when there should be distributed to the poor of Badsworth, 6s. 8d., under the *superintendence of the rector*. The chaplain was to be learned in plain song and grammar and should be present in the choir of the parish church on every Sunday and festival at matins, mass, vespers, complin, and other divine services in his surplice; and was to read or sing as the rector should deem fit. He should not be absent from the said church for more than a month at a time, and then not without the licence of the rector. He should not play at dice and other illicit games, except on the 12 days after Christmas, and should not frequent the tavern or ale houses at unseemly times, *i. e.*, in the summer time, from the feast of the Annunciation to the Nativity of the B. V. M. after the hour of ten p. m., and in the winter time, from the Nativity of the B. V. M. to the Annunciation after 9 p. m. He was not to alienate the goods, books, jewels and ornaments of said chantry. If he should be convicted of incontinence, theft, rape, perjury, or other crime, or if he should be prevented by loss of any limb from performing his duties he should be removed by the rector. Quoted by Page in Yorkshire chantries from Duchy of Lancaster Records, Div. XI, vol. 25, p. 1.—Moyes in *Dublin Review* for January and April, 1899, in an article entitled "A Chantry Foundation" gives at length the charter of the foundation of the collegiate chantry of Robert Lord Bouchier (the first English lay Chancellor) at Halstead. It is dated November 12, 1411. Therein are given minute details, especially financial details. But its length forbids quotation here.

<sup>19</sup> At St. Paul's London, for example 54 chantries had by union been reduced to 37 at the time of the suppression.

at the same time be obtaining a view of the evil effects of the chantry system in society, for the one is intimately bound up with the other. The good effects we shall reserve for a special paragraph.

The duties of the chantry priest varied as I have stated above according to the will of the founder. One duty only was essential—the saying or singing of mass daily for the soul of the donor or for the souls of the persons named by him. But in addition to this office, by the will of the founder, many chantry priests acted the part of curates, others assumed the office of school master or librarian, while a great number, located in cathedrals, collegiate houses and large parish churches, followed the duties of the choir. And this last office, when rightly performed, was no light labor. It began at dawn with the solemn recitation of Matins and Lauds, followed, at short intervals, by Little Hours and High Mass. In this way most of the morning was taken up while part of the afternoon was occupied in the singing of vespers and complin.

But after eliminating the number of chantry priests occupied in these various ways there still remained some priests, just what proportion to the whole body it is impossible to say, who had no other duty aside from the morning Mass. This office accomplished, and, though slight, some did not hesitate to neglect it, the rest of the day was theirs to do with as they pleased. There can be no doubt that some of this class, with perhaps a number of those who performed additional duties, spent it and some of the nights too, in the taverns and in doings little in harmony with their priestly office. Evidence of this is had in the wills,<sup>20</sup> in the records and memorials of episcopal visitations,<sup>21</sup> and in the writings of men contemporary or almost contemporary with the existence of the chantry institution.<sup>22</sup>

But this evidence is by no means as damnatory as some would have us believe. No doubt it shows that *some* chantry

<sup>20</sup> See Sharp's collections, also those of Raine, Furnival and Thymm.

<sup>21</sup> See "Visitations and Memorials of Southwell Minster" (Camden Society), London, 1891, by Arthur Leach.

<sup>22</sup> Stow's "Chronicle" (passim), where many curious incidents are related; also St. Germain, "Salem and Bizance," wherein we see the author urging the adoption of stringent measures to prevent them from "frequenting the ale house, or tavern," etc.

priests were totally unworthy of their calling but, as St. Cyprian said of the confessors of old, "we must not allow the wicked and evil characters of the few to tarnish the honorable glories of the many"; for there can be no doubt that the preponderating majority of the chantry priests were good men, men whose noble lives of devotion and self sacrifice are recorded only in the book of time.

According to such an eminent authority as Page, indeed, the chantry priests were "quite uniformly of good behavior."<sup>23</sup> This testimony is concurred in by Brewer, than whom, few men, if any, are more fitted to speak on this period of English history,<sup>24</sup> and is also well borne out by a study of the certificates of Edward the Sixth's commissioners. Besides, we must remember that the chantry priests had every reason to preserve a good character, since in case of misbehaviour they were removable. And finally, the fact that throughout the whole pre-Reformation period men of broad learning and noble principles, men high in the offices of the Church and State, the people at large (for, as Stubbs remarks, to say that they were unpopular is without foundation<sup>25</sup>), and even the chantry priests themselves, when they were able, were engaged in making provision for this form of foundation—this fact I say of itself is of sufficient force to permit us to conclude that, as a class, the chantry priests were a respectable body of the clerical order.

To understand the existence of some bad chantry priests we need only to look at the cantarist's origin, education and home life. The chantry priests, like the other members of the clergy, were drawn from all ranks of society. No doubt those coming from the peasant class made up the main body, but those sprung from the more gentle folk were by no means rare. Indeed the wills of the period show that a very large proportion of those families who were in such circumstances as made it necessary for them to make a will had members or near kinsmen chantry priests.

<sup>23</sup> In introduction to the publication of "Yorkshire Chantry Records."

<sup>24</sup> Life of Henry VIII, Vol. II, p. 50. Quoted by Gasquet, "Eve of Reformation," p. 147.

<sup>25</sup> "Constitutional History of England," Oxford, 1887-1891, Vol. III, p. 380.

The amount of education possessed by these priests differed naturally according to their early opportunities. Most of those of good birth received their training in the best schools of the period—an education now recognized as broad and liberal; while there are not a few instances of chantry priests holding university degrees. But it cannot be said that, as a whole, the chantry priests were a well educated body of men. According to canon law it is true the cantarist like all other priests had to be able to read and write, to have a familiarity with the rules of grammar and with the ritual, and to possess a knowledge of the New Testament. But at times it happened, in admitting the candidate to orders, that some of those requirements were passed over. This sad state of affairs, if not begun, was at least greatly increased by the Black Death when, to secure the most necessary public religious ministrations, the most inadequately prepared subjects had to be accepted; and even those could be obtained only in insufficient numbers.<sup>20</sup> Thenceforward it was hard to check the evil. For with the increase of the wealth of the population "every mean man felt he must have a priest in his house to wait upon his wife." As a result great numbers animated primarily, and at times solely by the motive of securing an easy means of livelihood, entered the ranks of the priesthood as cantarists. Large numbers of them traveled from town to town seeking employment in the chantries precariously endowed. And it was this pitiful condition of affairs which caused More to cry out, "The whole order is rebuked by the priest's begging and lewd living, who are obliged to walk as rovers and live upon trentals or worse, or serve in a secular man's house."

The home life of the chantry priest was, in some instances, quite comfortable, some of them being provided with an appropriate house and garden, situated hard by the chantry chapel, while others were well housed as members of collegiate bodies. Some again had a home with the family of the benefactor. This last arrangement, however, tended greatly to bring the priesthood into contempt from the fact that often the cantarist was sent "to lie among the lay servants where he could neither use

<sup>20</sup> Consult Gasquet's excellent chapter on "Some Consequences of the Great Mortality" in his work, "The Great Pestilence," London, 1893.

prayed  
with  
evils  
churc  
obloq  
arise  
refer

B  
most  
serve  
with  
in th  
chim  
grou  
time  
matt  
forts  
frug  
pove  
by th  
habi  
he v  
eter  
A  
his  
larg

See a  
ton's  
estim  
worth

prayer nor contemplation." Still other chantry priests boarded with families of the town. But this too was the source of many evils; for by it, says an ancient writer, "divine service in the church is minished, occasions of insolence are given, popular obloquy is engendered and scandals and dangers to souls arise."<sup>27</sup> And it is to one of these, no doubt, that Chaucer refers in his *Shipman's Tale*, when he writes:

"In London was a priest, an annuller,  
That therein dwelled hadde many a year,  
Which was so pleasant and so serviceable  
Unto the wife thereas he was at table,  
That she would suffer him no thing to pay  
For board ne lodging, went he never so gay  
And spending silver had he ryht ynoil [enough]."

But for the most part the chantry priest's home life was most wretched. Two small rooms of a low timbered hut usually served as a domicile. Its rudely built walls, matted or plastered with clay or mud, were frequently without windows. A hole in the roof admitted a feeble light and served also as a chimney.<sup>28</sup> For fireplace there was marked off a space in the ground in which was burned some dry turf or, at Christmas time, a yule log. A bench, a stool, a wooden bedstead and a mattress of straw comprised the furniture and household comforts. And such was the place in which, cooking his own frugal meal, many a chantry priest, poor without professing poverty, led his half monastic life, till at a ripe age, mourned by the poor people of the village or town, clothed in the priestly habit of coarse woolen stuff in which he had worked and prayed, he was placed in a rough rectangular coffin and laid to his eternal rest.

As I have intimated the chantry priest was, as a rule, poor, his usual annual revenue being five pounds—a sum scarcely large enough to supply him with the bare necessities of life.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Quoted by Leach, p. xi of introduction to "Visitations and Memorials." See also Stow's *Survey* (passim) for curious and humiliating instances.

<sup>28</sup> For a description of a typical medieval house of peasant class see Fr. Johnston's article in *CATH. UNIV. BULL.* for July, 1898.

<sup>29</sup> The equivalent in our money for a pound of these days has been variously estimated. But we may safely say that a pound of the fifteenth century was worth at least eight or nine pounds of the present time.



Some indeed, to eke out a scanty living, were compelled, owing to their penury, to cultivate bits of glebe; others were able to add to their income by acting in the capacity of schoolmasters or librarians, while it is on record that some few took to stealing. In times when priests were comparatively few, however, the cantarists were not slow to take advantage of the pressing need of their services and demanded and received for their labors six, seven and even as high as ten pounds. But this was an abnormal state of affairs and we find the bishops taking stringent and successful measures to put a stop to it. Hence we may reasonably conclude that, after the close of the fourteenth century at any rate, notwithstanding the fact that the system of appropriation had lessened greatly the income of many of the parish clergy, there would be little incentive for a parish priest to leave

"his sheep accombred in the mire,  
And run unto London unto Seinte Poules  
To seeken him a chantry for souls—;

though before that period the lamentable practice was no doubt frequently indulged in. In such circumstances then, with many sprung from the lower class of society, without education, without a decent home or suitable revenue, in an age when the spirit of the priesthood in general had cooled, it is not surprising that a number of chantry priests, with plenty of time on their hands, should pass their lives in little harmony with the lofty ideals of their holy calling. Rather are we to be astonished that the body as a whole preserved a character of true priestly virtue.

The evils indulged in by some of the chantry priests and the important part which the devotion to the holy souls played in the foundation have caused most men to overlook the beneficent influence of the chantry system. This influence was, however, many-sided and lasting. In the first part of this paper when speaking of the different motives which moved men to build chantries I intimated the character of the good contemplated by the founders. It now only remains therefore for me to speak a little more in detail of what was actually accomplished.

It must be said, first of all, that the chantries were a great factor in the medieval scheme of relieving the poor—a work which the people of those days looked upon as a fundamental religious duty.<sup>30</sup> The wills of the period show that in nearly every case where a chantry was founded some provision for this purpose was made. We see, for example, that, as a rule, on the day of the donor's funeral, in the case of an individual foundation, or, if the chantry was the work of a guild, on the feast day of the saint in whose honor it was erected, alms were distributed—"a penny to each of a hundred men, three pence to three hundred, and food and drink enow." True this chantry alms giving, like much of the charity of the middle ages was, in general, indiscriminate, and yet there are many touching instances of benefactors taking care in the deed of foundation to direct their charity in special channels where it would do the most good, such as supplying of coal to the poorest among the families of the village, the maintenance of a bed in the village hospital and the like.<sup>31</sup> And though, according to the ideas of modern philanthropy, there may have been many evils connected with the chantry method of relieving the poor, yet it cannot be denied that it was incomparably better than no giving at all, and the best the times could possibly offer. That it accomplished real good is evident from the terrible evils which followed the abolition of the system—evils due in a great measure to this very change.<sup>32</sup> And that it cannot have been so utterly defective may be seen from a comparison with the results of the methods pursued in our own day. For with all our system and vast expenditure our alms giving is still quite indiscriminate and our abject poverty is greater.<sup>33</sup>

But if the benefit attending the eleemosynary work of the chantry was great, the influence the system had on the religious condition of the country was even more significant. The Black

<sup>30</sup> See Stubbs, "Const. Hist.," Vol. III, p. 619-620.

<sup>31</sup> *E. g.*, in the will of Percy Vale dated London, February 21, 1502, "To Master and Wardens of Merchant Tailors . . . 12 messauges . . . for maintenance of 2 chantry priests. The masters and wardens to spend annually the sum of 30 shillings, on the purchase of coals for poor parishioners of the parish of St. Mary, aforesaid."

<sup>32</sup> So say Gibbins, Rogers, Cunningham and other writers of economic history. *E. g.*, see Rogers, pp. 418 seq., "Work and Wages." See Stubbs, III, "Constitutional History," p. 620.

<sup>33</sup> See Gibbins, "Industry in England," London, 1896, p. 195 et passim.

Death had stalked abroad over the whole island. In round numbers some 25,000 members of the clergy had fallen victims to its awful ravages.<sup>34</sup> As a result "there was everywhere" writes the chronicler Knighton "such a dearth of priests that many churches were left without the divine offices, mass, matins, vespers, sacraments and sacramentals." In this lamentable state of affairs the chantry foundation came as an invaluable means of supplying the religious needs of a prostrated people. But the usefulness of the chantry in parochial work was by no means confined to times of special needs. Throughout the period of his existence the chantry priest acted in much the same capacity as that now occupied by the curate, saying the morrow mass,<sup>35</sup> visiting the poor and "holding up the crucifix before the eyes of the dying."<sup>36</sup>

But by far the most beneficent effects of the chantry system was its influence on the development of English education. Until within a comparatively short time this most useful work of the chantry, a work which our own age looks upon as god-like in character, was but little considered. Even Stubbs whose great book, "The Constitutional History of England," Maitland calls a training in justice,<sup>37</sup> gives it but scant attention, while he lays stress on the work of the noble statesman, "who after the dissolution of the monasteries, obtained in the foundation of grammar schools a permanent, free, and to some extent, independent source of liberal education for the people."<sup>38</sup> But recent investigation has clearly evidenced that before Edward the Sixth, before Henry the Eighth, before even the first rumblings of that upheaval which men have supposed brought light and liberty to a benighted and priest-ridden

<sup>34</sup> See Gasquet, "The Great Pestilence," pp. 203-204 seq.

<sup>35</sup> By the Morrow Mass is meant the mass said every morning "before sunrise, for such as be travellers by the way." Extract from a chantry certificate.

<sup>36</sup> Hundreds of examples of this might be taken from the volumes of surveys. As a sample I shall cite one, that of St. Katharine in the parish church of Selby: "The necessity thereof is to do divine service, and help the parish priest in time of necessity, to administer sacraments and sacramentals and other divine service. . . ." For "the said parish of Selby is a great parish, having but one curate, and the same parish is a thousand housling people; and the said curate has no help in time of necessity but only the said chauntry priest." "Yorkshire Chantry Surveys" (Surtees Soc.), p. 213.

<sup>37</sup> Maitland in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* for July, 1901. Article entitled "William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford."

<sup>38</sup> "Constitutional Hist.," Vol. III, p. 627.



population, grammar schools were a common institution in England. It is now admitted, indeed, by men whose word no one can gainsay that England was far better provided with grammar-schools before the Reformation than it has ever been since.<sup>39</sup> And one of these men, Mr. Leach, than whom no one is better fitted to speak, does not hesitate to call the much lauded Edward VI, so long hailed on all sides as the great patron of education, "the spoiler of grammar schools."<sup>40</sup> All Edward, or Elizabeth, or the statesmen under them did was to restore in part,<sup>41</sup> with scanty resources and more restricted aims, the grammar schools which had flourished under the form of chantries. And it is now quite certain that between the year 1547, the date of the chantry suppression act, and the year 1645, the date of the death of James I, no grammar school was founded which had not already existed as a chantry.<sup>42</sup>

Just when the chantries came to be used as grammar schools is hard to determine. All we know at present is that when the monasteries, which had supplied the learning of the early middle ages, lost their influence over the minds and hearts of the people at large, the chantries seem to have gradually assumed the educational character, and this they retained, notwithstanding many obstacles, till they were suppressed by law. But unlike the monasteries, which seem to have been frequented more by the country gentlemen and the rich, the chantry schools were patronized more by the middle and lower classes. The reason for their popularity is quite obvious. They were free schools. In them the "ignoble and degenerate offspring" of the humblest peasant was enabled without expense to acquire that preparatory training necessary to fit him for the University. And in these latter institutions there were offered, says Stubbs, abundant facilities and fairly liberal inducements to scholars. Nor were the poor slow to see the great advantages. For in 1406 we find them petitioning "that every man

<sup>39</sup> Rashdall, *Harrow School*, Ch. II, p. 12. See article in *Dublin Review* for April, 1899, on "Medieval Grammar Schools," by J. B. Milburn.

<sup>40</sup> *Contemporary Review* for 1892, Vol. 62, p. 393. Cf. also Dr. Shahan's article in *Catholic Times* for December, 1894.

<sup>41</sup> Edward the Sixth restored about one third.

<sup>42</sup> Leach, *ubi supra*.

or woman of whatever state or condition he shall be, shall be free to set their son or daughter to take learning at any school that pleaseth them within the realm."<sup>43</sup> By the granting of this petition by Henry IV, and that at "a time when the supply of labor ran so low that no man who was not worth twenty shillings a year in land or rent was allowed to apprentice his child to a craft," the path which led to the highest positions in the Church and State was opened to the poor, and a high grade of learning was assured on all sides. Thus their existence is of itself a conclusive argument against the time-worn assertions of the dense ignorance of the period.<sup>44</sup>

The instruction received in these chantries was by no means of an elementary character. True, the course of studies pursued was not so varied as that which obtains in the grammar school of the present day. But we cannot say they were much the worse off for that reason. The principal subject was Latin, for without a knowledge of that language it was impossible in those days to pursue a course in the universities or to make any progress in the learned professions. The grammar taught was that of Donatus, tutor of St. Jerome. But the word grammar had not then the restricted meaning given to it in the present day. It then stood for scholarship—"an acquaintance with Latin literature derived from a reading of the classical authors, and the power to speak as well as to write the language."<sup>45</sup> Among the authors studied were Terence, Cicero, Sallust, Cæsar, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and Prudentius. But besides these works, writing, in Greek, Hebrew and French was also taught, and that not in a perfunctory manner but so thoroughly as to render them the medium of conversation during recreation.. The method followed in the teaching of these matters did not greatly differ from that now pursued in our schools, excepting in so far as the

"Rotuli Parl.," III, 602. Stat., II, 158, quoted in Stubbs, "Const. Hist.," Vol. III, p. 627.

"The Paston Letters show that "not only that family but also friends and neighbors, lords, commoners and domestic servants possessed the art of writing, and that no one of any rank or station in society was quite illiterate." And a recent writer has said that education in pre-Reformation England was less restricted than it has been from that time till within a quarter of a century.

<sup>45</sup> J. B. Milburn, *Dublin Review*, July, October, 1899, p. 167.

deep religious spirit which then presided over all is now sadly lacking.<sup>46</sup>

It is as yet impossible to state precisely the number of chantries supporting these grammar schools. But already thanks to the publications of the English government and of different historical societies we are able to arrive at an estimate which cannot be far from the exact figure. The wills of the period show that in a comparatively large number of instances it is expressly stated that schools shall be maintained in connection with the chantries, whereas, by the returns of the commissioners of Edward the Sixth, we know that there were a great number of instances in which grammar schools, though not explicitly specified in the will, were in fact, supported by the foundation.<sup>47</sup> This was done sometimes in accordance with the wish of the governing bodies, sometimes by long custom and sometimes because the priest found profit in thus supplying a demand. Now calculations based on a study of the wills and on the commissioners' returns show, I think, that ten per cent. of the whole number of chantries founded were educational; or in round numbers that in England "when the floods of the great revolt called the Reformation were let loose" there were more than 300 chantry grammar schools.

We have no definite means of determining the exact number of pupils attending these schools, but no doubt it must have been very large. For while it is true that those attending them who could afford to pay were expected to do so, yet it must be remembered that these schools were really free schools, "teaching gratis the poor who ask it humbly for the love of God." Hence we are not surprised to find that they were attended not

<sup>46</sup> I cite the following beautiful prayer which the pupil of a Scottish Burg School recited every morning. That offered up by a student of a chantry school could not have greatly differed.

"I thank Thee, heavenly Father, that Thou hast willed that the past night has been prosperous for me; and I pray that Thou wilt also be favorable to me this day, for Thy glory and the health of my soul; and Thou who art the true light, knowing no setting, sun eternal, enlivening, supporting, gladdening all things, deign to enlighten my mind, that I may never fall into sin, but by Thy guiding arrive at life eternal. Amen. Jesus, be Thou Jesus to me; and by Thy chief spirit strengthen me—et spiritu principali confirma me." Grant, "Burg Schools," p. 60.

<sup>47</sup> In Lincolnshire out of ninety foundations (the place was only sparsely inhabited and the population was poor) nine were by deed of foundation grammar schools. "Chetham Society Publications."

only by the children of the neighborhood but also by those whose homes were at some distance. These last boarded with families living in the vicinity of the chantry, frequently on the proceeds of a fund specially set apart for the purpose by the generous chantry founder; or they were cared for in hospitals founded for that purpose in connection with the chantries. For the hospital of the middle ages was more often a house for the poor than a hospital for the sick.

Many of the eminent men of the later middle ages received their early education at these chantry schools, and not a few even began their career of greatness in the humble capacity of chantry priests. These were not forgetful of the benefits of the chantry institutions, and in after life we find some of them in grateful memory rearing free colleges that larger numbers might be able to enjoy their own early opportunities.

It may appear a long step from the simple but useful chantry to the college, *e. g.*, the magnificent establishments of Eton and Winchester. But these colleges were really chantries or collegiate churches of a larger type and the powerful influence for good which they have wielded in their long life through the centuries is owing to the chantry institution.

But the great good which these chantries had been doing and were still able to do did not shield them from the unholy designs of those who coveted the riches with which they were endowed. The great wealth to be derived from their plunder brought their suppression into consideration at the time when the court was discussing the dissolution of the monasteries. As early as 1529 we find an act passed forbidding any religious person, regular or secular, to receive a stipend or salary for the singing of masses for the dead. Again in 1536 Cranmer, in a sermon at St. Paul's, expressed as the King's desire, that the chantry should be destroyed. But these early threatenings seem to have been without immediate effect, since we find that the establishment of new foundations still continued without interruption for many years. But that these menaces were not idle is seen from Henry's action in November, 1545. In that year, the thirty-seventh of his reign, under the plea that the revenues of the chantries would enable him to defray the ex-

penses of his wars with France and Scotland, and at the same time lighten the heavy tax burden of the people, he caused his parliament to place at his disposition all chantries, colleges, free chapels and hospitals throughout the realm.<sup>48</sup> But this act, while it was of such a general nature as to include even the great universities,<sup>49</sup> did not vest the chantry properties immediately in the crown. It merely empowered Henry to appoint commissioners to carry it into effect; and until the work of the commissioners would be completed the original owners could not legally be disturbed.<sup>50</sup>

In accordance with this act therefore, for which the generous parliament received the heartfelt thanks of the most gracious sovereign, men were appointed to enter in possession of such chantries, colleges and other foundations as should be named in their commissions. But it so happened that at the death of Henry, only a few of these commissions had been executed. In consequence the appropriation of the chantry lands, for the time at least, was not carried out, and before Edward, Henry's boy successor, could proceed to take possession of them, a new law giving him power to that effect was necessary.

Such a law, however, was not long in forthcoming. The rich booty to be derived from the suppression was never for a moment lost sight of by the greedy courtiers. Accordingly, on December 6, 1547, a new law was introduced in Parliament. By it, chantries, colleges, free chapels, etc., not actually seized during the late reign were declared the possession and seisin of the king and his successors forever.<sup>51</sup> The passage of the bill was strenuously resisted. But the greed of the unscrupulous men who surrounded Edward won the day. First the Lords, and shortly afterwards the Commons, gave consent. The crown thus became possessor of the lands, goods, rents, and tenements of nearly 3,000 foundations. No pressing state need

<sup>48</sup> Stat. 37, Henry VIII, ch. 4.

<sup>49</sup> The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge with the colleges of Winchester and Eton were included, and in the breaking up of Parliament, notice was sent to both the universities, and colleges that they were at the King's disposal. This put them to petitioning for mercy which was soon obtained and letters of thanks were sent for the continuance of them.

<sup>50</sup> Dodd's "Church History of England," etc., by Rev. M. A. Tierney, London, 1839, Vol. II, p. 13.

<sup>51</sup> Stat. I, Ed. VI, ch. 14.

was assigned for the passage of this nefarious measure and the promise of devoting the proceeds to the maintenance of grammar schools, to the competent endowment of the vicarages and to the establishment of larger parishes, was not fulfilled. The real end of the measure, as Milman points out, "was to satisfy the unprincipled and rapacious members of the council and their adherents."

In the beginning of March, 1548, commissioners were dispatched throughout all the shires of the country to make a survey of the chantries and other institutions which had been placed in the hands of the king. And thereupon followed a spoliation in comparison with which the recent lootings in China and the Philippine Islands are but as the shadow to the substance. "The halls of country houses were hung with altar cloths; tables and beds were quilted with copes; the knights and squires drank their claret out of chalices and watered their horses in marble coffins." It was, indeed, says Peter Heylin, "a sorry house and not worth the naming which had not somewhat of this furniture in it though it were only a fair large cushion, made of a cope, or altar cloth, to adorn the windows or make the chairs appear to have somewhat in them of a chair of state."

But aside from the cruel and blasphemous desecration of sacred vessels—objects dearer to the hearts of the people than words can tell, as being consecrated to all that was sweetest and most beautiful and most hopeful in their lives, aside, too, from the unjust and violent methods used in the prosecution of this spoliation, the suppression of the chantries had other evil effects of a more social character. By it a deep and lasting wound was inflicted on the whole structure of English society. It swept away the very basis of practically the whole of the secondary education. True, the system of instruction had received a serious blow in the destruction of the monasteries. But in the spoliation of the chantries the effect was more deadly. For the monasteries had been the schools mainly of the richer classes who one way or another might be able to supply, in some measure, the loss, whereas the chantry schools were the source of learning for the peasantry, the country's pride, who,

by t  
of t  
L  
vide  
mor  
igno  
a fe  
best  
crea  
L  
dem  
the  
feeli  
trea  
thos  
caus  
rich  
had  
"A  
Ugl  
the  
ben  
in t  
of t  
life  
ruin  
Edw  
"su  
of t  
mid  
"co  
inst  
deri  
in t  
befo



by their destruction, had no alternative but to lapse into a state of ignorance with all its attendant evils.

Here and there, it is true, some foundations previously provided for by pious endowment were continued under new and more limited ordinances. At a later period, when the cry of ignorance was heard all over the land, dilapidated remains of a few others were reconstructed and made fit for use, but at best these efforts only partially satisfied the crying need created by the maelstrom of fanaticism and greed.

Education, however, was not the only thing to suffer by the demolition of the chantries. Art too felt the baneful effects of the blow. The English people were unable to shake off the feeling of depression which came over them as they saw their treasures—those beautiful works in gold and silver and stone, those stained glass windows and beautiful vestments—all caught up in one fell swoop and deposited in the homes of the rich all over the land. A dull despair of ever replacing what had been so ruthlessly destroyed took possession of them. "Art died out in the land and King Whitewash and Queen Ugliness reigned supreme for centuries."<sup>52</sup>

The chantry suppression act sounded the death knell of the English guild system. Never after did these great benefit societies of the middle ages take any active part in the public life—a part which in the care for the sick, the help of the poor and the development of the free and noble social life of the English, was of priceless value. The guilds were ruined. For even if it were true, as Ashley affirms, that Edward VI did not intend to "abolish," or "dissolve" or "suppress" or "destroy" them, yet, in the practical working of the statute, that is just what happened.<sup>53</sup> The guilds of the middle ages, to use Ashley's own expression, were simply "coöperative chantries,"<sup>54</sup> primarily and principally religious institutions. Most of their wealth in lands and stocks was derived from and increased by donations inspired by motives, in those days, regarded as religious. Hence to take from

<sup>52</sup> Jessop in *Nineteenth Century* for March, 1898. Parish Life in England before the Great Pillage.

<sup>53</sup> Ashley, "English Economic History," p. 154.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 138.

them their religious character was to deprive them of the very source of their existence and to leave only an empty and useless shell. The heart which sent the bright blood of life through them and gave them the power for the great good they were accomplishing was thus ruthlessly ripped out and trampled on. Nothing was left to them but to die a speedy death. And so it came to pass; for from that moment the companies fell away in power as they fell away in faith.

Besides we are not so sure that the destruction of the guilds was not really the intention of the king. It is not so certain as Ashley asserts, that of the guild revenues only those devoted to religious purposes were confiscated.<sup>55</sup> Original documents in the Record Office prove that revenues devoted to ends which do not come under the head of what Ashley considers religious purposes were the object of the greedy clutch of the spoilers, and this too with the consent of the king. For in the reports of the commissioners sent to inquire into the possession of the guilds a black pen stroke is drawn through every recommendation to spare the corporate property which went for the maintenance of the poor. This was done by the crown official through whose hands the reports passed, intimating, says Gasquet, that the king, not recognizing any strict right on the part of the poor, would take possession of the entire property.<sup>56</sup>

When we consider that few parishes throughout the realm were without guild lands,<sup>57</sup> donated by chantry founders for the support of the poor and aged, for the maintenance of hospitals,<sup>58</sup> for the building of roads, the repair of bridges, and the like, we may realize, to some degree at least, what a terrible effect this chantry act had on the condition of England at large. And while it cannot be denied that much of the woeful destitution of the sixteenth century was due to economic changes, to the succession of bad harvests from 1527 to 1536, to the agrarian revolution, and to the expansion of trade,<sup>59</sup> yet it is none the less certain that it is also due, in no

<sup>55</sup> Ashley, "English Economic History," p. 152.

<sup>56</sup> Gasquet, "Eve of Reformation," pp. 384-385, also introduction to Cobbett's "Reformation."

<sup>57</sup> Rogers, "Econ. Interpretation of History," London, 1888, p. 15.

<sup>58</sup> One hundred and ten hospitals mostly in form of chantries were destroyed.

<sup>59</sup> Rogers, "Econ. Int. of Hist.," p. 242, seq.



small measure, to the disestablishment of the chantries.<sup>60</sup> And though it may not be said absolutely, that the poor law was the direct result of the chantry suppression, yet it is undeniable that this measure left open a door for the introduction of that law.

With the great sufferings of the poor came also untold hardships to the priests themselves. For by this act thousands of them were suddenly deprived of their means of livelihood, and, without provision, were cruelly left to do as best they might. True, as was done in the case of the ejected monks some years before, a pension about equal to what they had received while acting in the capacity of chaplains was, by law, granted to them. But for various reasons, the payment of the pensions, in all but comparatively few cases, did not long continue. As a result hundreds of the chantry priests were soon reduced to the extremities of want. Besides they were ridiculed and publicly insulted in the streets, the boys "reveling, tossing of them, taking violently their caps and tippets from them."

Some writers have endeavored to show that this unholy suppression of the chantries was not at all unwelcome to the people at large. And in truth it cannot be denied that in the beginning there were some, not a few, who sympathized with the movement. No doubt too many of these were animated by the purest motives. They were daily witnesses of most shocking laxity in the lives of some chantry priests. They felt the need of reform. And that there was urgent need of reform should not surprise us. For we must recollect that the religious life is a spiritual life. Nature has to be held in constant check. From time to time all devoting themselves exclusively to religion need to be held up and to be made to begin afresh. If external helps be removed, then after a long period of freedom and owing to a variety of circumstances, the spiritual life grows weak. The Church teaching and church laws remain in force but they lose their power to exact obedience. Thus the wave of laxity moves along and grows in strength—soon sweeping over large bodies of the religious world. The people

---

<sup>60</sup> Gibbins, "Industry in England," p. 208.

at first seem not to note the degeneracy. But suddenly all awaken to the existence of this state of affairs. Some laugh sarcastically at it. Others try to hide it. Others again, and among them noble types of the priesthood, stand out and throw all their strength against it, while large numbers, crying out wildly and without waiting for the slow moving Church to act, take it upon themselves to bring about a reform. This happened with regard to the chantry priests. But it was not the first occurrence of the kind. The Wycliffite movement was of a similar nature. It was however the first time in England that such a movement had behind it the state power and a large body of nobles moved on by lust and avarice. Hence its success.

With this in mind then we are not surprised that many good souls should for a time look kindly on this agitation against the chantries believing that it was inspired by holy and unselfish motives. But they were soon undeceived, as Burnet himself is forced to admit, when they saw "the open lewdness in which many (of the destroyers) lived, without shame or remorse . . ." when they saw "the gross and insatiable scrambling after the goods and wealth . . ." when they saw the spoilers' "irregular and immoral lives."<sup>61</sup>

As for the main body of the people their opposition to the chantry destruction is undoubted. For notwithstanding the fact that the middle classes and the poor were absolutely in the power of the great who had been bribed and who, in turn, were themselves at the mercy of the king, the chantries were not dissolved without strong opposition. "In Yorkshire in 1548 the inhabitants of Leamer, near Scarborough, and the neighborhood, rose under the leadership of William Ambler of East Heslerton yeoman, Thomas Dale parish clerk of Leamer, and one Steavenson, and in the night set the beacon alight at Staxton, collecting a company of about three thousand persons, who went to the house of Matthew White, one of the commissioners under the act of Edward the Sixth and particular receiver of chantry lands, and dragged him, one Clapton, his

<sup>61</sup> Burnett, Gilbert: "History of Reformation of the Church of England," (edited by N. Pocock), 7 vols., London, 1865; Vol. III, pp. 216, 217.

wife  
Sava  
Walt  
try l  
Lean  
tions  
of th  
shire  
intro  
blood  
N  
tries  
the f  
many  
the k  
fathe  
prom  
succe  
their  
Ask  
A  
prote  
says  
carri  
prom  
very  
that  
witho  
lar u  
T  
succe  
what  
ment  
and i  
actual  
supp  
St

"York

wife's brother, one Savage, supposed to have been Richard Savage, Sheriff of York in 1540, and one Berry, servant to Sir Walter Mildmay, one of the commissioners for the sale of chantry lands, from their beds, and carried them to the wolds near Leamer, and there murdered them."<sup>62</sup> Nor were like insurrections confined to a few localities. They broke out in all parts of the country, the most dangerous being in Cornwall, Devonshire and Norfolk. But German and Italian mercenaries were introduced and the protests of the people choked in their own blood.

Nor again was the resistance to the spoliation of the chantries restricted to the common people. For, notwithstanding the fact that nobles were bought off by the chantry treasure, many stoutly resisted the iniquitous proceeding, declaring that the king had no right to seize property given by their forefathers for a specified object—an object too that the king had promised to protect. In some cases this opposition met with success. Chantry properties were allowed to be retained by their lawful owners, as was the case of the chantry of St. Anne, Askrigg. But such cases were very rare.

As to the chantry priests themselves we hear but very little protest from them. Though the people most concerned history says little about their manner of acting while the law was being carried into effect. Most of them no doubt were silenced by the promise of pensions. Besides they were almost universally very poor, and long distances separated one from another so that there could come from them no concerted action. But without doubt they took an active share in the numerous popular uprisings.

This brings our brief study of the chantry to a close. If successful it has served to bring out in consecutive narration what has been but briefly touched upon in a variety of documents and histories—the nature of the chantry, its appearance and its importance in pre-Reformation life, as seen from its actual accomplishment and from the evils consequent on its suppression.

CORNELIUS HOLLAND.

ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

---

<sup>62</sup> From Wilson's "History of York," Vol. I, p. 132, quoted by Page in "Yorkshire Surveys," Vol. I, p. xvi.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.<sup>1</sup>

## SOURCES:

(a) *Documentary:*

- Bliss, W. H., and Johnson, C. Calendar of entries in papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland, 3d vol. (1342-1362). (Rolls Series), London, 1893-1897.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. Complete works, ed. by W. W. Skeat, 7 vols., Oxford, 1894-97. (Canterbury Tales, Vol. IV.)
- Furnival, F. J. (editor). Fifty earliest English wills (The) in the Court of Probate, London (1387-1454). (Early English Text Society), London, 1852.
- Fowler, J. F. (editor). Acts of the chapter of the collegiate church of St. Peter and St. Wilfred, Ripon—(1452-1506). (Surtees Society), London, 1875.
- Leach, A. F. (editor). Visitations and Memorials of Southwell Minster. (Camden Society), London, 1891.
- Page, William (editor). Yorkshire Chantry Surveys—being the certificates of the commissioners appointed to survey the chantries, guilds, hospitals, etc., in the county of York. 2 vols. (Surtees Society), London (1898?).
- Ramsay, A. Paston Letters (abridged). 2 vols., London, 1840-41.
- Sharpe, R. R. Calendar of wills proved and enrolled in the court of husting, London, 1258-1688. 2 vols., London, 1889-1890.
- Tymms, Samuel. Wills and inventories from the registers of the Commissary of Bury St. Edmunds, and the Archdeacon of Sudbury (1370-1650). (Camden Society), London, 1850.
- Raines, F. R. (editor). A history of the chantries within the county Palatine of Lancaster—being the reports of the royal commissioners of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Mary. London.

(b) *Archæological, Historical, Antiquarian:*

- Leach, A. F. (editor). Early Yorkshire schools (Vol. I). York, Beverly, Ripon (Yorkshire Archeological Society), Record Series, Vol. XXVII, London, 1899.
- Pecock, Reginald. The Repressor of overmuch blaming of the clergy. Ed. by Churchill Bobington (Rolls Series), 2 vols., London, 1860.
- Raine, James (elder). History and Antiquities of North Durham. London, 1852.
- Raine, James (younger). Historians of Church of York and its Archbishops. (Rolls Series), 3 vols., London, 1879-94 (Vol. III).
- Stow, John. A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster and of the Borough of Southwark. 2 vols., London, 1754-5.

<sup>1</sup> This list does not aim at being exhaustive.

## SECONDARY COLLECTIONS:

(a) *Historical works of a general character with sections bearing more or less directly on the question of the chantries:*

- Burnett, Gilbert. History of the Reformation of the Church of England. (Ed. by N. Pocock), 7 vols., London, 1865.
- Capes, W. W. A History of the English church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. New York, 1900.
- Denton, William. England in the fifteenth century. London, 1898.
- Dodd's Church History of England with notes, etc., by Rev. M. A. Tierney, London, 1839.
- Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain; from the birth of Jesus Christ until the year 1648.
- Green, J. R. History of the English people. 4 vols., London, 1877-80.
- Lingard, John. A History of England to 1688. 10 vols., London, 1883.
- Pearson, C. H. English in the fourteenth century. London, 1876.
- Trevelyan, G. M. England in the Age of Wycliffe. London, 1899.
- Waterworth, J. Six historical lectures on the origin and progress in England of the change of religion called the Reformation. Phil., 1842.

(b) *Historical works treating of special questions, and containing some references to chantries:*

- Chandler, William. Life of William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester (with an appendix of records). London, 1811.
- Cobbett, William. A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland, with notes and preface by F. A. Gasquet, New York, 1896.
- Cutts, E. L. Parish priests and their people in the middle ages. London, 1893.
- Gasquet, Francis Aiden. The Great Pestilence, 1348-49. London, 1893.
- Gasquet, F. A. Henry VIII and the English monasteries. London, 1889.
- Gasquet, F. A. Eve of the Reformation. Studies in the religious life and thought of the English people in the period preceding the rejection of Roman jurisprudence by Henry VIII. New York, 1900.
- Grant, James. History of the Burg Schools of Scotland. London, 1876.
- Green, Mrs. J. R. Town life in the fifteenth century. 2 vols., London, 1893.
- Harris, Miss Darmer. Life in an old English town. London, 1898.
- Jessop, Augustus. The coming of the Friars and other essays. London, 1890.
- Lea, H. C. An historical sketch of sacerdotal celibacy in the Christian Church. Boston, 1894.
- Milman, H. H. Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral. London, 1869.
- Montalambert, Comte de. The Monks of the West (with introduction by F. A. Gasquet). London, 1896.
- Stubbs, Wm. The Constitutional History of England to 1485. 3 vols., Oxford. 1887-1891.

(c) *Economic, Historical:*

- Ashley, W. J. An introduction to English economic history and theory. 2 vols., London, 1888-93.

- Cunningham, Wm. The growth of English industry and commerce. 2 vols., Cambridge, 1890-92.
- Cunningham, Wm. An essay on Western civilization in its economic aspects. Vol. 2: Medieval and modern times. Cambridge, 1900.
- Gibbins, Henry de B. Industry in England. (Historical outlines), London, 1896.
- Levasseur, E. Histoire des classes ouvrières et l'industrie en France avant 1789. Paris, 1900.
- Maitland, Frederic William. Township and Borough. Cambridge, 1898.
- Rogers, J. E. T. A History of agriculture and prices in England, 1259-1793. 6 vols. (Vol. I), Oxford, 1886-1887.
- Rogers, J. E. T. Six centuries of work and wages: the history of English Labor. London, 1890.
- Rogers, J. E. T. The economic interpretation of history. London, 1888.

(d) *Canon Law:*

- Ferraris. Bibliotheca, etc. (Vol. II under C.) 9 vols., Rome, 1885-1899.
- Maitland, F. W. Roman Canon Law in the church of England: six essays (reprinted from the English Historical Review and the Law Quarterly Review). London, 1898 (first three essays).
- Thomassin, Louis. Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'église touchant les bénéfices et les bénéficiers. 3 vols., Paris, 1725.
- Van Espen, J. B. Jus Ecclesiasticum universum, etc. 5 vols., Lyons, 1727.
- Wilkins, David. Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, A.D. 446-1718. 4 vols., London, 1737. (2 and 3 vols.)

(e) *Miscellaneous:*

- Church, Alfred J. The chantry priest of Barnet. (A Tale of the Two Roses.) London, 1885.
- Ducange. Glossarium et Scriptores mediæ et infimæ latinitatis. 6 vols., 1733, Paris. (Under words cantuarua et capellania.)
- La Grande Encyclopédie. Inventaire raisonné des sciences, des lettres et des arts. Lamirault et cie, Editeurs, Paris.
- Palgrave, R. H. Inglis (editor). Dictionary of Political Economy. 3 vols., London, 1894-1900.

*Magazine articles:*

- Academy, XXXVII, p. 223—Chantry priests, by J. Moyes.
- Archeological Journal (passim).
- British Archæological Association Journal, XX, p. 111 (1864). Wayside Chapels, by F. R. Wilson.
- Catholic Times, Philadelphia, for December 1, 1894, "Grammar Schools," by Dr. Shahan.
- Contemporary Review for 1892—Edward VI. Spoiler of Schools, by A. F. Leach.
- Dublin Review for October, 1894. Papal jurisdiction in Medieval England, by Mgr. Moyes.



- Dublin Review for January and April, 1899. A Chantry foundation, by Mgr. Moyes.
- Dublin Review, April, 1899. Medieval grammar schools, by J. B. Milburn.
- Irish Ecclesiastical Record, Vol. VIII, 1900. A Forgotten Chantry, by J. B. Cullen.
- London Quarterly, XXXII (1869). Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral, by H. H. Milman.
- Nineteenth Century, March, 1898, p. 433. Parish life in England before the great pillage, by A. Jessop.
- Nineteenth Century, October and November, 1899. Parish life in medieval England, by A. Jessop.
- Notes and Queries (passim).
- Revue Bénédictine, Vol. VII, 1890. Les offrandes.
- Revue Bénédictine, Vol. XV, 1898, Le IX centenaire de l'institution de la commémoration des défunts.
- Revue des Questions Historiques, for 1895, Vol. LVII. La société au commencement du XVI siècle, d'après les homélies de Josse Clichtoue, 1472-1543, by H. Chérot, S.J.
- Saturday Review, Vol. LIX, p. 344. Chantries.
- Tablet, September 25, 1880. Guilds of Catholic London.
- Tablet, July 30 and August 6, 1898. The first lay Lord Chancellor, by Mgr. Moyes.
- Tablet, September 3, 1898. Christian Democracy in Pre-Reformation times. (Paper read at Catholic Conference at Nottingham. Dom A. F. Gasquet.)
- University Bulletin (Catholic). Articles by Dr. Shahan and by Fr. Johnston.

*Bibliographical:*

- Gardiner, Samuel, and Mullinger, J. Bass. Introduction to the study of English History. Third edition. London, 1896.
- Gross, Charles. The sources and literature of English history from the earliest times to about 1485. London, 1900.

## MARRIAGE OF NEAR KIN.

Kinship within certain limits is regarded by nearly all mankind as an impediment to marriage, though the degree of consanguinity constituting such a bar varies among different peoples. Almost universally the ties existing between parent and child and between brother and sister having the same father and mother are recognized as preventative of marital union. Yet even these bonds have not always availed as a hindrance to marriage. In his *Memorabilia* Xenophon represents the sophist Hippias as expressing to Socrates the opinion, that the law which forbade parents to intermarry with their children was not from the gods, for the reason that the speaker found some nations that transgressed it. Who these nations were, however, Hippias does not inform us.<sup>1</sup> The astronomer Ptolemy is more specific, for he states in his *Tetrabiblos* that, owing to the stellar influences under which they fall, most of the inhabitants of India, Ariana, Gedrosia, Parthia, Media, Persia, Babylon Mesopotamia and Assyria, have children by their own mothers,<sup>2</sup> and St. Jerome, writing against Jovian, says that "the Persians, Medes, Indians, and Ethiopians, marry their mothers, grandmothers, daughters and granddaughters."<sup>3</sup>

Whatever doubt may exist concerning the incestuous character of the alliances contracted by the other peoples whom Ptolemy and St. Jerome mention, the corresponding testimony of a number of authors compel us to believe that instances, more or less numerous, existed of intermarriage not only between brother and sister, but even between parent and offspring, among the Persians. Quintus Curtius tells us that a satrap of Naura at the coming of Alexander the Great, was the father of two sons by his own mother, "for," says the biographer, "in those regions it is allowed parents to form

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, Lib. IV, Chap. IV, 20.

<sup>2</sup> "The *Tetrabiblos* or *Quadripartite* of Ptolemy," trans. from the copy of Leo Allatius by James Wilson, Book, II, Chap. III, p. 67.

<sup>3</sup> S. Hieron, *adv. Jov. Lib.*, II, C. 7. See Migne, P. L., tom. 23, p. 296. "Persæ, Medi, Indi et Ethiopes regna non modica et Romano regno paria cum matribus et aviis, cum filiabus et neptibus, copulantur."

shameful unions with their children."<sup>4</sup> Plutarch asserts that one of the beneficent results following upon the conquest of Alexander, was that the Persians were taught to venerate their mothers and not to possess them as wives.<sup>5</sup> The same writer also informs us that the Persian King Artaxerxes married his two daughters, Amestris and Atossa,<sup>6</sup> and Diogenes Laertius writes: "It is not unlawful for the Persians to wed their daughters, a thing which would be considered by the Greeks most wicked."<sup>7</sup> Again Athenæus relates that Antisthenes, in one of his treatises reproaches Alcibiades with having had illicit relations with his mother, as well as with a daughter and a sister, after the manner of the Persians.<sup>8</sup> But needless to say, whatever evidence this notorious gossip may furnish is of little worth except as giving some cumulative value to the deposition of other witnesses more reliable.

To the list of those who charge the Persians with the practice of marrying their mothers, must be added the names of the author of the *Recognitions*, of Tertullian who relies on the questionable Ctesias, of Minutius Felix, St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Theodoret and St. John Chrysostom.<sup>9</sup> Finally, as late as the sixth century Agathias speaks of the Persians of his day as contracting alliances of this kind though these connections, he says, were at variance with the former manners of the country, their origin being attributable to the teaching of Zoroaster. The same historian tells us that Artaxerxes, the son of Darius, when his mother Parysatis besought him to marry her, refused to do so on the ample ground that such a union would be consonant "neither with religion nor with the laws of the country, nor with good morals."<sup>10</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Quintus Curtius Rufus; *De Reb. gest. Alex.* Lib. VIII, C. II. "His in fidem acceptis, in regionem quam Naura appellant rex cum toto exercitu venit, satrapes Sysimithres duobus ex sua matre filiis genitis, quippe apud eos parentibus stupro coire cum liberis fas est."

<sup>5</sup> Plutarchi, *De Alex. Mag., Fortuna aut Virtute Oratio prima*, V.

<sup>6</sup> Plutarchi omnia quæ extant cum Lat. interpret Crusarii Xylandri, Vol. I, p. 1025.

<sup>7</sup> Diogenis Laertii; *De Clar. Philosoph. vitis, etc.*: Pyrrho, Lib. IX, 83.

<sup>8</sup> Athenæi *Dipnosophist. sive Cœnæ Sapient.* Lib. V, Cap. XIV.

<sup>9</sup> Clemens Romanus *Recognition.* Lib. IX, Cap. XX, Apolog. C. IX. *Ad Nationes*, Lib. I, C. XVI. Octav. C. XXXI. *Pædagog.* Lib. I, C. VII. *Contra Celsum*, Lib. V, C. XXVII; Lib. VI, C. LXXX. *Præpar. Evang.*, Lib. VI, 10. *Græc Affect Cur.*, Serm. IX, 935. *De Virgin.* VIII in *Epist* 11, ad Cor. Homol., VII.

<sup>10</sup> Agathias, *De Imper. et Reb. gest Just. Vulcanius.* *Venitiis*, 1729, Lib. II, p. 44 E, et p. 51 A.

The contention of Agathias that this incestuous custom arose among the Persians from the influence of the religion of Zoroaster is worthy of note. That the tree of Zoroastrianism ever bore such fruit the Parsees, the modern disciples of Zoroaster, most stoutly deny. Certain it is the word *Khvetuk-das* current among the Parsees to-day to designate marriage of near kin does not connote a union of a closer consanguinity than the second degree. It is no less certain that the sense of this expression as it is found in the remnant of the Avesta that has come down to us—the sole document of an intrinsic authority representing the ancient discipline of Zoroaster—does not give warrant to the assertion of Agathias. According to West “the term *Khvetuk-das* ‘does not occur at all in the oldest part of the Avesta, and when it is mentioned in the latter portion it is noticed merely as a good work, which is highly meritorious without any allusion to its nature; only one passage (*Vend.*, VIII, 36) indicating that both men and women can participate in it.’”<sup>11</sup>

But if the Avesta gave no literal sanction, as far as we can know, to marriage within the first degree of kindred, the better Pahlavi works contain many references to the holiness of such alliances and the duty of contracting them, and it is not unlikely that Agathias derived his appreciation of the influence of Zoroastrianism from some of these versions which, as we possess them at present, first appeared about his time.<sup>12</sup>

Another evidence of the attitude of the Avesta towards marital union with next of kin is supplied by those authors who impute the custom of marrying a mother, not to the Persian people at large, but to the hereditary sacerdotal caste—the Magi. As the Avesta was originally written for the Magi only, we would expect to find the doctrines inculcated by it finding first expression in the life of these priests. And that the members of this class took to wife their mothers, Xanthus, who it is said flourished shortly after the death of Cambyses, bears witness in a text preserved by St. Clement of Alexandria. The geographer Strabo and the apologist Tatian<sup>13</sup> bear the same

<sup>11</sup> See E. W. West, *Pahlavi Texts*. In “*Sacred Books of the East*,” Vol. XVIII, p. 427.

<sup>12</sup> West, *loc. cit.*

<sup>13</sup> *Stromat.*, Lib. III, C. 2. Strabo, *Lib. XV*, C. III, 20. Tatian, *Oratio ad Græcos*, C. 28.

testimony of the Magi, while Catullus is more particular still when he tells us that a Magus, according to the Persian religion, should be born of a marriage formed between mother and son.

Nam Magus ex matre et gnato gignatur oportet  
Si vera est Persarum impia religio.<sup>14</sup>

The religious ordinance here mentioned by Catullus was of the Magism, which, together with the Magi themselves, was introduced by Cyrus into Persia from the province of Media.<sup>15</sup> Hence the declaration of Agathias that marriage with a mother was a departure from the former manners of the Persians, is seen not to offer the contradiction which Mr. Adam in his article in the *Fortnightly*<sup>16</sup> thought it offered to the testimony of Xanthus who, in his early day, as already said, represents the Magi as having entered into this kind of unions. In view too of the fact that Magism in all its observances did not prevail throughout Iran until six centuries after the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, the language of Artaxerxes II describing the solicited marriage with his mother, as opposed to the dictates of religion, becomes clearly intelligible.

Restricted at first to the Magi, the practice of marrying a mother naturally enough in course of time would be taken up by the laity. At first this form of incest would seem to be confined, as a distinctive usage, to the more exclusive classes. And so we learn from Philo that the "magistrates of the Persians marry even their own mothers and consider the offspring of such marriages the most noble of all men."<sup>17</sup> But such a badge of aristocracy would not be long exclusive. Hence it is we find so many writers attributing the custom of contracting these alliances to the nation generally.

The statements, however, regarding the extent of these marriages among the Persians, made by Greek writers or on the authority of such, cannot but be regarded with suspicion. The Greek historian and biographer were posterously prejudiced against foreigners and their habitual proneness to color falsely and exaggerate whatever they might

<sup>14</sup> Catull., Carm., XC, 3.

<sup>15</sup> Xenophon, Cyrop., VIII, I, 23.

<sup>16</sup> W. Adam, "Consanguinity in Marriage," *Fortnightly Review*, 1865, Vol. II.

<sup>17</sup> Philonis Judæi De Special Leg., trans. by C. D. Yonge, Vol. III, p. 306.

find of ill-repute in other lands must be ever borne in mind when we read their reports of the incestuous connections of the Persians.

As the Persians had received the institution of Magism from the Medes so these in turn received it from Babylonia. The tradition therefore recorded by Said Ebu-Batrich, Patriarch of Alexandria (876-940), according to which the first Magus to take his mother to wife was the first also whom Nimrod, the founder of the Babylonish Empire, constituted minister of fire-worship, is not without some historic interest.<sup>18</sup> The grandson of this Nimrod was Ninyas and he, the Spanish presbyter Orosius informs us, married his mother Semiramis,<sup>19</sup> though, according to Agathias, this son murdered his mother that he might free himself from her importunate solicitations.<sup>20</sup>

Herodotus tells us that not until Cambyses espoused his sister Atossa was intermarriage of brother and sister known of in Persia.<sup>21</sup> Before this time however, as Wilkinson clearly gathered from the sculptures found both in Upper and Lower Egypt, marriage with a sister took place among the Egyptians,<sup>22</sup> and Diodorus says that common report had it that such alliances were ordained by law in this land.<sup>23</sup> Maspero is of opinion that the union of a father and daughter was perhaps not wholly forbidden among the ancient Egyptians,<sup>24</sup> but of this he adduces no substantial evidence.

<sup>18</sup> Quoted in Selden *De Jure Naturali et Gentium*, Vol. 1, Tom. I, Lib. V, Cap. XI. "Dicitur enim is (Nimrod) primus qui ignem coluit. Scilicet cum videret flammæ e longinquo in oriente ascendentes e terra illac ut penitius eas contueretur descendit, atque eas adoravit. Illic vero hominem constituit qui sacra ministraret igni et in eum thura porrigeret. Atque ab eo tempore coeperunt magi ignem colere atque adorare eum. Nomen autem hominis quem Nimrod constituit sacrum ignis ministratorem erat Andshan, cui diabolus e medio ignis hisce usus est verbis Nemo hominum potis est rite igni ministrare nec mea sacra callere, nisi commisceatur cum matre sua, et sorore sua et filia sua. Fecit itaque Andshan juxta quod dixerat ei diabolus. Et ab eo tempore qui sacerdotio apud magos functi sunt, commisceri solebant cum matribus et sororibus suis et filiabus suis. Et Andshan hic primus erat, qui hunc morem incepit." Selden would lead us to think that the Patriarch of Alexandria based his story on data furnished by oriental monuments. Sayce, however, is authority for the statement that outside of the account of Gen. X no historic traces whatsoever can be found of Nimrod.

<sup>19</sup> Orosii, "Adv. Pag. Hist.," Lib. VII, lib. I, C. IV.

<sup>20</sup> Agathias, op. cit., Lib. II, p. 44, D.

<sup>21</sup> Herod., Hist., Lib. III, 31.

<sup>22</sup> Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, "The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians," ed. by Samuel Birch, Vol. I, p. 319.

<sup>23</sup> Diodor., I, 27.

<sup>24</sup> G. Maspero, "The Dawn of Civilization in Egypt and Chaldea," p. 50.



Whether or not the marriages spoken of by Diodorus and Wilkinson were with a full sister such as that of Cambyses, we do not know for certain, though that such they were we would infer from the well-known alliances of the Ptolemies who, without any sign to indicate that they had departed from the former practice of the Egyptians, took to wife their sisters german.

If we are to believe Garcilasso de la Vega, the Incas of Peru were wont to marry their sisters, for this chronicler narrates that Manco Ccapac, the first of the Peruvian kings, espoused his sister and his "legitimate and illegitimate sons also married their sisters to preserve and increase the descendants of the Incas."<sup>25</sup> But the account given by Garcilasso of the origin of his royal race, caught up, as he tells us, from the tales which he heard as a child from the elders of his people, possesses nothing beyond the value of interesting folk-lore. Moreover, Acosta positively asserts that marriages between brother and sister were always held as unlawful among the Incas, until in the sixteenth century Tapa Inqua Tupanqui married "Mamaoello his sister by the father's side, decreeing that the Inquas might marry with their sisters by the father's side and no other."<sup>26</sup>

If the human race was to descend from a single pair, it was inevitable that the first son of this pair could only marry one born of the same parents as himself. And so the wife of Cain was his own sister. Upon the rapid multiplication of the species however, the partriarchs ceased to intermarry with their full sisters, and even as we would infer from the words of Abraham, Gen. XX, 12, with their uterine sister. Still they continued to form their marital alliances only within the circle of their near relations, Abraham telling the "elder servant of his house" to "go to my country and kindred and take a wife from thence for my son Isaac," and Isaac in turn charging his son to go "to the house of Bathuel, thy mother's father, and take thee a wife thence of the daughters of Laban, thy uncle." When Esau married two of the Hethite women he gave such

<sup>25</sup> Garcilasso de la Vega, first part of the "Royal Commentaries of the Yncas," trans. by C. R. Markham, Vol. I, p. 93.

<sup>26</sup> Joseph Acosta, "The Natural and Moral History of the East and West Indies," trans. by E. G., London, 1604, p. 470.

offense to his parents that to appease them he took to wife Mahaleth, the daughter of Ismael, his uncle.<sup>27</sup>

Of closer consanguinity was the marriage of Abraham with his half-sister, Sarah;<sup>28</sup> of Nachor with his niece Melsha,<sup>29</sup> and probably Amram with Jochabed, who in Ex. VI, 20, is said to be the aunt of her husband.<sup>30</sup> It is to be observed that the blood connection existing in the marriages just mentioned was upon the father's side only. And because such connection did not operate to prevent marriage in these instances anthropologists have maintained that the relationship here obtaining, through the male line, was unrecognized. But freedom to contract these alliances, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter, cannot be construed as a disregard of male kinship. Barring the possible case of Amram and Jocabed which is clearly exceptional, this freedom is to be referred to the familial conditions which obtained at the time.

The Hebrew legislation against marriage of near kindred is to be found in Lev. XVIII and XX and in Deut. XXVII.<sup>31</sup> Of the thirteen verses (6-18) in Lev. XVIII that bear upon the degrees of relationship declared to be a bar to matrimonial union, there are six that refer to consanguinity.<sup>32</sup> These pro-

<sup>27</sup> Gen. XXIV, 2, 4; XXVIII, 1, 2; XXVI, 34, 35; XXVIII, 8, 9.

<sup>28</sup> Gen. XX, 12. According to Josephus (*Ant.*, Lib. I, Cap. XII) Sarah was the niece, not the sister of Abraham. This interpretation St. Jerome is inclined to follow (*"De Perp. Virg. B. M."*, 15) though he admits that the more apparent sense of the text, is that Sarah was the sister, not the niece of Abraham. The reason prompting St. Jerome and St. Augustine (*cont. Faust.*, XXII, 35) to think that Abraham could have been the uncle only, and not the half-brother of his wife, was that in the opinion of these Fathers, a marriage with a half-sister, was even in the time of the patriarch so contrary to right order, that a man of Abraham's sanctity could not have contracted it.

<sup>29</sup> Gen. XI, 29.

<sup>30</sup> In Num. XXVI, 59, Jochabed is designated as the daughter of Levi. In Ex. VI, 20, she is called "dodha" (aunt). This in the LXX, strange to say, is rendered "the daughter of the brother of his father." The Vulgate translates it "patruelis."

<sup>31</sup> On the question of authorship and date of composition of Lev. XVIII-XXVI and for literature thereon see *"The Levitical Priests,"* by Samuel Ives Curtis, Jr., Edinburgh, 1877, pp. 69 and ff. For the same question concerning Deut. see Hummelauer, *"Com. in Deut."*, introduc., p. 5 et seq. in *Cur. "Scrip. Sac. Lethielleux,"* Paris, 1901.

<sup>32</sup> These forbid marriage with a mother, a granddaughter, whether daughter of a son or of a daughter, with a stepmother's daughter, a paternal aunt, and finally with a maternal aunt. Lev. XX and Deut. XXVII prohibit no consanguineous marriage not already forbidden in Lev. XVIII, but Lev. XX, 17, declares that he who marries "the daughter of his father or the daughter of his mother" shall, with the partner of his guilt "be slain in the sight of their people," while Lev. XX, 19, prescribes that a nephew and aunt maternal, or paternal, that shall enter into marital relations with each other

hibitions directed to the male rather than to the female would inculcate primarily reverence for the person of the father as the head of the family. This high position and authority of the polygamous father the prohibitions of Lev. XVIII, 6-8, ever suppose, sanction and immediately regard. And because the union of an uncle and niece, such as was that of Nachor and Melsha, did not cast upon this paternal preëminence the shadow of disparagement that was thought to be offered it by the alliance of a son and an aunt, the former of these marriages escaped the prohibition pronounced against the latter.<sup>33</sup>

Centered about the father the Israelitish family formed a group more or less independent and self-sufficient. In the marked division that set off the polygamous households of this people, one from another, the bonds of relationship between the children of brothers and sisters were so loosened that the reason for constituting a matrimonial impediment to the intermarriage of cousins german which might exist in different conditions of society, is seen to have not yet prevailed.<sup>34</sup>

---

"shall bear their iniquity." Finally Deut. XXVII, 22, testifies to the deep reprobation in which matrimonial alliance with a sister the daughter of father or mother is held, by crying upon it a curse.

The opinion of those who declare that these prohibitions refer not to marriage but to incest outside of wedlock, is generally repudiated. See S. E. Dwight, "The Hebrew Wife," p. 48, ff.; also Michaelis, "Com. on the Laws of Moses," trans. by A. Smith, pp. 46-47.

<sup>33</sup> It is true the Old Testament makes record of no indisputable instance of marriage contracted between an uncle and niece, that of Othniel and Axa (Jos. XV, 17) being questionable on account of the uncertainty regarding the degree of kinship existing between Othniel and the father of his wife. We learn though from Josephus that Joseph the son of Onias, the high priest, married his niece and the manner in which, according to the historian, this alliance was brought about would lead us to believe that it offered no violation to law or custom among the Jews (Josephus, Ant. XII, 4, 6). The marriage of Herod the Great and his two sons will also be remembered. But as Herod the Great married his half sister (Joseph., op. cit., XVII, 1, §3) and Herod Antipas his brother's wife, both of which unions were clear offenses against the law, it were manifestly unwarrantable to conclude that the matrimonial alliances of these kings with their respective nieces, bore reliable testimony to the legality of such marriages among their countrymen. There is, however, a well-known incident connected with the union of Herod Antipas, that gives it an evidential value which otherwise it would not possess. This incident was the rebuke administered to Antipas by St. John the Baptist. This Herod, it will be recalled, was censured for having espoused Herodias, his brother's wife, no mention being made of the fact that in so doing he had also married his own niece. Had the alliance been unlawful on this last-named ground as well, we may safely assume that the stern Precursor would not have failed to declare it so. Moreover, Herodias was the niece of Herod Philip, her first husband, just as she was of her second, yet the Baptist refers to this former marriage as to a perfectly legitimate union (Joseph., op. cit., XVII, 1, 3; XVIII, 5, 4. Mark VI, 17, sqq.).

<sup>34</sup> St. Ambrose endeavors to deter Paternus from joining in marriage the son and granddaughter of the latter on the ground of an interdict thought to be implied

But not only did family range apart from family, among the Jews, but as was natural where there was a plurality of wives, sub-families arose. Rachael and Lia and the concubines of Jacob abode in their own separate tents (Gen. XXXI, 33) and were severally under the one head, the genius of a household quite complete in itself. Members of a different sub-family, brothers and sisters agnatic, might easily come to entertain for each other sentiments that normally could find no place among children reared in the mutually intimate companionship ordinarily following upon the circumstance of birth from a common mother. So it was Abraham took to wife his half-sister Sarah, and as we would infer from Gen. XX, 12, the Hebrews in the patriarchal period were not unaccustomed to contract the same kind of marriages. That they ceased for a time to enter into these unions after the promulgation of Lev. XVIII, 9-11 seems most probable, considering the strikingly forceful expression which they heard given to the prohibition against marriage with a half-sister and the dire punishment with which a violation of this law was threatened. The incident of Amnon and Tamar (2 Kings XIII, 13) however would lead us to suspect that, even in the days of David, the interdiction placed upon such marriages was not rigidly enforced, and we gather from Ezekiel XXII, 11, how persistently the temptation to such form of incest continued with this people.

In examining the legislation enacted against incest among the Hindus we notice the markedly greater extent to which kinship stretches out from the paternal as compared with the maternal line. "In all pure Hindu Society," says Alfred Lyall, "the law which regulates the degrees, within which marriage is interdicted, proceeds from the theory that between agnatic relatives *connubium* is impossible."<sup>35</sup> This appears clearly in the law of Manu, which declares that "a (damsel) who is neither a

in Lev. XVIII, 6; the saint arguing that, since the alliance between cousins german was forbidden, much more so was the union between persons of closer kinship. S. Ambr. ad Pater, Epis. LX; cf. Migne, P. L., col. 1183. But St. Ambrose puts too wide a meaning upon Lev. XVIII 6. And as there is no prohibition in the Scripture quoted, against the intermarriage of cousins german the principle that "he who constrains to the lesser does not absolve from but binds also to the greater," which the Bishop of Milan lays down, finds not the application he would make of it.

<sup>35</sup> A. C. Lyall, "Asiatic Studies, Religious and Social," p. 156.

Sapir  
on th  
wedde  
lasts  
the f  
gotra  
name  
indef

M  
tinuo  
the E  
peopl  
we sh  
marit

In  
the m  
lines  
ship.  
this r  
some  
desce  
sion  
there  
name  
was p  
system

T  
origin  
howe  
relati  
conn  
regar  
the c

"  
Kshatr  
mercan  
"  
tionshi  
female.  
"  
the sam  
4cr

Sapinda on the mother's side, nor belongs to the same family on the father's side is recommended to twice-born men for wedlock and conjugal union."<sup>36</sup> The Sapinda relationship lasts to the sixth degree,<sup>37</sup> but descent from the same family on the father's side which constitutes one a member of the same gotra<sup>38</sup> and is made known by the possession of a common surname, gives rise to an impediment that goes along the male line indefinitely.

Mr. McLennan is undoubtedly right in describing the continuous impediment to intermarriage on the male side among the Hindus as a relic of a former social condition among this people. Such a bar to intermarriage arose from the practice, we shall have occasion to describe later, of never contracting marital union with a member of the same gotra or clan.

Incapable of keeping but an easy and loose kind of record the members of these clans would choose one of their ancestral lines to the neglect of the other in tracing their clan-relationship. Among the Hindus, as among the more advanced clans, this relationship would be reckoned from the father's side. In some editions of the Laws of Manu it is specifically stated that descent from the same father is made known by the possession of the same family name. The fact of clan kinship therefore was in the beginning declared by a common surname and hence between those of the same surname marriage was prohibited. Hence also a one-sided and disproportionate system of relationship was inevitable.

The Hindus in marking their kinship ever kept in mind origin from a common clan or gotra. It would be quite natural however that with some peoples the remembrance of a near relationship should be lost sight of in the name which at first connoted this relationship and the sign should come to be regarded rather than the thing signified. We observe this in the case of the Chinese.

<sup>36</sup> "The Laws of Manu," III, 5. The Brahmana (the sacerdotal), the Kshatriya (the governing and military), the Vaisya (the agricultural and mercantile) castes are the twice-borne ones, Manu, X, 4.

<sup>37</sup> Manu, V, 60. According to Gautama, Vishnu and Narada, Sapinda relationship does not go beyond the fourth degree where the common ancestor is a female.

<sup>38</sup> Among the Brahmins membership in the same gotra means descent from the same Rishi.



Among this people the male only is accounted the primitive stock of the family tree, as the male descendents only are considered the branches of this tree. These descendents never take but the father's name and between those of the same name, no matter how remote is the degree of consanguinity between them, marriage is prohibited.<sup>39</sup> Since among this people surnames are extraordinarily few, there being, according to Mr. Medhurst,<sup>40</sup> but 530 of them throughout the whole Chinese Empire, the limitation which is thus put upon intermarriage is seen to be narrow indeed.

The penalties attached by the Chinese to the violation of the law regarding intermarriage between those of the same stock are definitely prescribed. The Rev. Pierre Hoang, in his excellent brochure, "*Le Mariage Chinois*," tells us that such unions are declared void, and in cases where the parties escape the death punishment, the woman is separated from her consort, and the nuptial presents are confiscated. We are informed by the same writer that if a man and woman who are of the same stock, but beyond the fourth degree—not counting the stock—shall marry, they shall each of them receive 100 blows of the rod. Relatives on the paternal side, to a closer degree, who shall intermarry shall be sent into exile for a determined period. But he who shall take to wife his paternal grand-aunt, or a cousin german of his father, born to a paternal grand-uncle, or his cousin german born to a paternal uncle, shall, with the partner of his incest, be promptly strangled to death. Finally, he who shall marry a paternal aunt, a sister or a daughter of his son, shall, with his marital mate, be speedily decapitated. Kinship through the female line is termed, among the Chinese, external relationship, and the impediments to intermarriage following upon it are not as extensive as those resulting from connection through the male. Thus marriage with a uterine sister entails three years' exile and 100 stripes of the rod for the woman, and military banishment for the man. So too, the children of two sisters or of a brother and sister may intermarry; never, however, may the offspring of two brothers.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Le P. Pierre Hoang, "*Le Mariage Chinois au point de vue legal*," p. 6.

<sup>40</sup> W. H. Medhurst, "*Marriage Affinity and Inheritance in China*," in *Trans. Roy. As. Soc., China Branch*, Vol. IV, quoted by Westermarck, "*History of Human Marriage*," p. 305.

<sup>41</sup> Hoang, op. cit., pp. 46, ff., and 51, ff.



The Greeks of the post-Homeric age esteemed lightly their marriage bonds, the Lacedæmonians especially so, yet the grosser forms of incest they shunned. Tertullian, it is true, accused the Macedonians of having indulged the intimacies of which the Persians were held guilty, but his accusation which seems to rest on no other ground than the outburst of ribaldry which greeted the enactment of the play of *Cedipus* in the theater at Macedon<sup>42</sup> is not sufficiently supported. And both Tatian and Diogenes Laertius refer to the abhorrence entertained by the Greeks towards the unions reported as peculiar to the Persians.<sup>43</sup> Marriage with a half-sister, however, was permitted to the Greeks, both by the person or persons whom history calls *Lycurgus*, and by *Solon*; the former as we learn from *Philo*<sup>44</sup> allowing the Spartans to take to wife a sister uterine but not agnatic, while the latter gave the Athenians liberty to espouse a sister agnatic but not uterine. With the liberty accorded by *Solon*, *Cimon* married his half-sister *Elpinice*,<sup>45</sup> as did *Archeptolis Mnasiptolema*,<sup>46</sup> *Alexander* the son of *Pyrrhus*, *Olympias*,<sup>47</sup> *Mithridates Laodice*,<sup>48</sup> *Mausolus*, *Artemisia*,<sup>49</sup> and *Dionysius* of *Syracuse*, *Sophrosyna*.<sup>50</sup>

Marital union with a half-sister, legal among the Greeks, was forbidden to the Roman whose law regarding marriage of near kin was a reflex of the high domestic virtue which characterized the citizen of the Imperial City in its nobler days. This law the Roman, even in the season of wildest debauchery, did not forget or disregard. For though otherwise depraved, his horror towards incestuous alliances ever remained. To this sentiment of horror, their poets gave testimony.

Says *Lucan*

—cui fas implere parentem  
Quid rear esse nefas?<sup>51</sup>

and *Virgil*, pointing to one among the damned tells us:

<sup>42</sup> Tertullian, "Ad Nationes," CXVI.

<sup>43</sup> Tatian, loc. cit., *Diog. Laert.*, op. cit.

<sup>44</sup> Philo, "De Spec. Leg. Thomas Mangey," 1742, Vol. II, p. 303.

<sup>45</sup> Nepos, "Vita Cimonis, Cap. I.

<sup>46</sup> Plut., in Them., tom. II, p. 500.

<sup>47</sup> Justinus, Lib. XXVII, C. I.

<sup>48</sup> Justinus, Lib. XXXVII, C. III.

<sup>49</sup> Strabo, Lib. XIV, C. II.

<sup>50</sup> Plut. in Dion., C. VI, tom. V.

<sup>51</sup> Lucanus, *Pharsal*, 8.

Hic thalamum invasit natæ, vetitosque hymenæos.<sup>52</sup>

We may quote here, too, as bearing the same idea, the story told by Agathias of the Roman philosopher who, warned in a dream,

Μή θαψῆς τὸν ἀδαπτον, ξα κυσε κύρμα γένεσθαι  
Γῇ παντων μήτηρ μητροφθόρον οὐ δεχετ' ἄνδρα.<sup>53</sup>

awakes to find that the offended earth had in very truth spewed out, as it were, the body which he had given to it.

The Roman family was founded, not upon ties of blood, but upon the power vested in the *paterfamilias*. The Latin word "familia," derived from the Oscan term "famel," signifying a slave, bears witness to the absolute sway that originally rested in the head of the Roman household. Yet despite this exalted authority of the husband over the wife no distinction was drawn between the blood relationship with the father and that with the mother in prescribing the degrees of kinship prohibiting intermarriage. These prohibiting degrees extended along the right ascending and descending line indefinitely. In the collateral line those within the third degree could not intermarry. A single exception was made to this law in the case of a brother's daughter, which was brought about "when the divine Claudius took to wife Agrippina the daughter of his brother."<sup>54</sup> But Constantine, in accordance with the sentiments of the Roman people, afterwards repealed the exception introduced by Claudius forbidding marriage with a brother's daughter under pain of death. Beyond the third degree, marriage was allowable, except in the instance of a granddaughter, "for when we may not lawfully marry the daughter of any one, we may not marry the granddaughter." And as of the granddaughter, so also of the great-granddaughter and the sister of a great-grandfather. These persons, though beyond the third degree, were considered as coming within the scope of the prohibition against unions in the right ascending and descending line, connection with them being likened to that between parent and child.<sup>55</sup> From a text of Ulpian we learn that in the ancient Roman law, the prohibition to intermarry extended to first

<sup>52</sup> Æneid, Lib. VI, 623.

<sup>53</sup> Agathias, op. cit., p. 50 E et seq.

<sup>54</sup> Gal., I, 62.

<sup>55</sup> Instit Just., I, 10, 3. Dig. XXIII, 2, 7, 2. Ibid., XXXIII, 2, 39.

cousins.<sup>56</sup> Later on we find such a marriage at one time forbidden, at another made lawful, until eventually it is interdicted under penalties most severe by Theodosius the Great.

In passing to a consideration of marriage between near of kin among savages, we recall the passage of Andromache, in which Euripides makes Hermione declare that amidst all barbarians, father married with daughter, son with mother and brother with sister, without any hindrance from law or custom.<sup>57</sup> The statement of the poet is dramatically stronger for its sweeping character, but for the same reason it can possess but little historic value. Ovid is not more definite when he tells us

Gentes tamen esse feruntur  
In quibus et nato genitrix et nata parenti  
Jungitur.<sup>58</sup>

According to Herodotus the Massagetæ held their wives in common, while the Auseans had no marriage but lived together like gregarious beasts. Solinus testifies to the promiscuous cohabitation of the sexes among the Garamantes, and Aristotle refers to a similar practice among the Libyans.<sup>59</sup> But these instances do not afford examples of a disregard of kinship as prohibitive of intermarriage. Herodotus indeed tells us that the Massagetæ, though communal marriage existed among them, had each his own wife, and this, together with the fact that the Auseans were at pains, according to this historian, to determine by artificial means the paternal parentage of their healthy offspring, leads us to think that the so-called promiscuity of these people was similar to the promiscuity observed among the Spartans. These Greeks, we know, recognized no crime in adultery,<sup>60</sup> and cared not who was the father of their children as long as a

<sup>56</sup> Ulp. Frag., 5, 6. See also Plutarch, *Quæst. Rom.*, 6.

<sup>57</sup> Euripides, *Andromache*, 173 et seq.

τοιούτων πᾶν το βαρβαρον γένος  
πατήρ τε θυγατρὶ παῖς τε μητρὶ μίγνυται  
κορὴ δ' ἀδελφῷ . . .  
καὶ τῶνδ' οὐδὲν ἐξείργει νόμος.

<sup>58</sup> Ovid *Metam.*, Lib. X, 331.

<sup>59</sup> Herod., "*Hist. Lib.*," I, C. 216. *Ibid.*, Lib. IV, 180. Solinus, "*De Memorab. Mundi*," C. XXXII. Aristotle, *Pol.*, II, 3, 9.

<sup>60</sup> Xenoph., *De Rep. Laced.*, I, 789.

strong progeny was born to the state,<sup>61</sup> and yet we also know that relationship through the father operated to check intermarriage among them. The same may be safely said of the Garamantes and Libyans. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the evidence for a general Hetairism is not coextensive with the evidence for the absence of any horror of incest. The one may be present amidst a wide prevalence of the other. The cases mentioned by McLennan of conjugal infidelity, of polyandry, of the wantonness of the women in some savage tribes<sup>62</sup> are not therefore instances in which kinship within certain degrees was not recognized as a stop to intermarriage. The same must be affirmed of the examples, which Sir John Lubbock and others adduce of certain modern savages who recognize no marriage as we understand it.<sup>63</sup> To show that these savages take no heed of relationship as an impediment to marriage, a more specific and particular testimony is necessary than that which would merely disclose a wide promiscuity.

That, however, an impediment to intermarriage springing from nearness of kinship quite universally exists among savages, we know from the ample testimony of travelers which is detailed for us in the works of anthropologists. It is observed that, as a rule, the number of persons affected by this impediment is greater among uncivilized communities than among those more advanced in the social scale. Indeed, among savages the bar to intermarriage reaches beyond the pale of relationship by blood and prevents marital union between members of the same clan. We have seen that the original families into which the Hindus and Chinese were divided had, as their distinguishing mark, a common surname. Among many savages, however, a sign more readily suggesting itself to the untutored mind designates family from family, clan from clan. This is the name of some vegetable or animal—the *kobong* of the Australian, the *totem* of the American Indian. And between those of the same kobong or totem marriage is never contracted.

<sup>61</sup> Aristotle, *Polit.*, II, 9.

<sup>62</sup> John F. McLennan, "Primitive Marriage," p. 176 and ff.

<sup>63</sup> Sir John Lubbock, "The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man," pp. 86, 95.

own  
ogan  
betw  
as w  
fam  
obta  
soci  
T  
pear  
natu  
fit in  
polo  
prom  
show  
ditic  
mus  
brou  
the p  
capt  
neces  
obse  
ever  
mar  
M  
to th  
of w  
soug  
wom  
the r  
decre  
more  
impe  
anoth  
F  
deter

64  
p. 140  
65

The practice among savages of marrying outside of their own clan Mr. McLennan has called by the fitting name exogamy. This custom, as is clear, puts a check to marriage between persons that are unrelated by blood. Nevertheless, as we shall see, in a following article, from the nature of the familial conditions of the early clans among whom exogamy obtained, it is to be identified with the bar, which in civilized societies, stops consanguineous unions.

The practice then of seeking a wife from a strange clan appears among people so diverse and so widely separated that its nature cannot be set off by the narrow characterization that may fit institutions of a purely local compass. And as many anthropologists would most firmly deny that such a practice could be prompted by an instinct of nature they are at special pains to show its evolution from the influence solely of external conditions. Thus Mr. McLennan is of the opinion that exogamy must have arisen from a scarcity of women in the tribe, brought about by female infanticide, the unbalancing in the proportion of the sexes compelling the men to resort to the capture of foreign women for wives. This "usage induced by necessity would in time establish a prejudice among the tribes observing it—a prejudice strong as a principle of religion, as every prejudice relating to marriage is apt to be—against marrying women of their own stock."<sup>64</sup>

Mr. Spencer is ready with a different account. According to this writer women of a hostile tribe—and tribes at the period of which it is question, were ever hostile one to the other—were sought as trophies of war. The possession of these captured women as prizes by a few inevitably incites a desire for them in the many, "and as the number of those who are without them decreases, the brand of disgrace attaching to them will grow more decided; until, in the most warlike tribes it becomes an imperative requirement that a wife shall be obtained from another tribe—if not in open war, then by private abduction."<sup>65</sup>

Finally, Sir John Lubbock attributes this custom to the determination on the part of the men of the tribe to gain wives

<sup>64</sup> McLennan, "Studies in Ancient History," p. 111; "Primitive Marriage," p. 140.

<sup>65</sup> Herbert Spencer, "The Principles of Sociology," Vol. I, pp. 619-621.

as their own private property. "We must remember," "says this anthropologist, "that under the communal system the women of the tribe were all common property. No one could appropriate one of them to himself without infringing on the general rights of the tribe. Women taken in war were, on the contrary, in a different position. The tribe as a tribe had no right to them and men surely would reserve to themselves exclusively their own prizes. These captives then would naturally become the wives in our sense of the term."<sup>66</sup>

The positive variance with objective reality presented by these different theories anthropologists themselves have not been slow to point out to one another. Mr. McLennan's hypothesis, it will be observed, rests upon the two postulates of female infanticide and the resultant scarcity of women. Mr. Fison has shown that Mr. McLennan has absurdly exaggerated the existence of female infanticide, as he has also shown that the motive alleged by the latter for such inhuman conduct could not have availed with the savage.<sup>67</sup> The supposition of female infanticide disproved, the consequent supposition of a scarcity of women must be discredited.

The theories of Mr. Spencer and Sir John Lubbock would take for granted that, in the battlings between savage tribes, individuals are wont to take captives of war. For only when the individual was the victor could the individual have the spoil. But Mr. McLennan well says that booty of war was ordinarily the accomplishment of groups, and, as such, subject to the disposition of many rather than of one.<sup>68</sup> Individual seizures of women, no doubt, were frequent, but they never could have been so common as to give rise to the system of exogamy. Moreover, as Westermarck justly remarks, the process of winning a wife, pictured by the authors just mentioned, could have been the exclusive performance of the stronger and conquering tribes. But where would the weaker and conquered tribes secure their matrimonial consorts?<sup>69</sup> Surely if there were scarcity of women anywhere, it would be among those who had lost their female companions to the rough prowess of their

<sup>66</sup> Lubbock, *op. cit.*, 135-136.

<sup>67</sup> Fison and Howitt, "Kamilaroi and Kurnai," p. 135, ff.

<sup>68</sup> McLennan, "Studies in Ancient History," p. 345.

<sup>69</sup> Edward Westermarck, "The History of Human Marriage," p. 315.



hostile neighbors. Yet exogamy was a custom among the weaker and conquered, no less than among the stronger and conquering tribes.

The anthropologists we have been considering might, it is true, reply to the question, put by Westermarck, why savages did not also take to wife the women of their own tribes, by contending that the scarcity of women would permit only of polyandry or communal marriage which, indeed, they say was originally practised. But if so, why do we not detect this polyandry and communal marriage among the men and women of the same tribe, coexisting with the capture of foreign women for individual wives? From the coexistence of such low unions the savage admittedly is not deterred through considerations of morality.

The theories offered by Messrs. Tylor and Morgan to explain the origin of exogamy, though more plausible than the ones just mentioned, are quite as insufficient. Mr. Tylor thinks that the savage was induced to this usage by a desire of political advantage and preservation to be secured by affiliation with a foreign tribe;<sup>70</sup> while Mr. Morgan is of the idea that the intermarriage of brothers and sisters in a group which he calls the "consanguine family" ceased because of the evils "which could not forever escape human observation."<sup>71</sup> These evils, we take it, were the physical defects that were supposed to be discernible in the offspring of marriages between near of kin. It needs, however, but little knowledge of the savage to be convinced that he would never submit to the kind of abstinence entailed by exogamy through the considerations presented by Messrs. Tylor and Morgan. Moreover, the hypothesis of the latter assumes in the savage motives that failed to suggest themselves to the greatest of the ancient law-givers when decreeing against marriage of near kin. These motives did not, as far as we can know, occur to Moses or the framers of the Laws of Manu when they formulated their enactments against incest. And the history of the Church reveals no thought of the physical deterioration of progeny as following from mar-

<sup>70</sup> Edward B. Tylor in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 267.

<sup>71</sup> Lewis H. Morgan, "Ancient Society," p. 424.

riages of consanguinity, until towards the close of the sixth century. Indeed, such a result, far from being obvious to the modern scholar, could hardly occur to the savage mind.

It is true that an Australian legend recorded by Mr. Fison makes the Good Spirit Muramura prohibit intermarriages among members of the same branch of a tribe because of the evil effects observed to have issued from the intermarriages of closest kin which took place after the creation.<sup>72</sup> But the particular nature of these evil effects the tradition does not disclose. Nor are we warranted in setting them down as the weakness or defect of offspring. Incapable of catching the purpose of a hidden law, the savage could only account for the extensive and striking phenomenon of exogamy by picturing it as brought about by the decree of a god. He could not but think that, in violating this practice, he would bring upon himself a condign evil. Did he have a clear idea of the nature of this evil he would not fail, considering its significance, to give it a more specific description.

Mr. Morgan lays stress on the foregoing tradition because of the basis of probability which he claims it establishes for the "consanguine family" described above;<sup>73</sup> just as Mr. McLennan attaches importance to the tradition, current among various peoples, that marriage was instituted by some legislator because of the evidence afforded by these traditions of a former state of promiscuity.<sup>74</sup> But because the Egyptians attribute the origin of marriage to Menes, the Chinese to Fohi, the Hindus to Svetaketu, the Greeks to Cecrops, a scientific argument is no more presented for a former state of promiscuity, than the same kind of an argument is afforded for the former existence of snakes in a particular island, by the legend that a certain holy man once expelled these reptiles from that island.

The stage of sexual promiscuity, Mr. Morgan confesses, "lies concealed in the misty antiquity of mankind beyond the reach of positive knowledge."<sup>75</sup> Yet into these primeval shades most anthropologists, nothing daunted, rush. And when we read

<sup>72</sup> Fison and Howitt, op. cit., p. 25.

<sup>73</sup> Morgan in introduction to Fison and Howitt's "Kamilaroi and Kurnai,"

p. 4.

<sup>74</sup> McLennan, "Primitive Marriage," pp. 174-175.

<sup>75</sup> Morgan, op. cit., p. 502.

of the grand generalizations based upon the custom observed among some peoples, of tracing kinship through females, upon the "expiation for marriage" and the *jus primæ noctis*, upon the practice of lending wives, upon the greater esteem paid by the Greeks to the *Hetairæ* than to their legitimate wives and finally upon the classificatory system of consanguinity found in 139 tribes or races, we cannot but express our accord with the judgment passed by Fairbairn upon our modern anthropologies, understanding of course the words of this judgment in the sense in which they are accepted by him who uses them. "Our modern anthropologies, says this author, are in heart and essence, as speculative as mediæval scholasticism, or as any system of ancient metaphysics. There is no region where a healthy and fearless scepticism is more needed than in the literature which relates to ethnography. There is no people so difficult to understand and to interpret as a savage people; there is no field . . . where testimonies are so contradictory, or so apt to dissolve under analysis, into airy nothings."<sup>76</sup>

Shunning then the domain of mere surmise we find among savage as well as among civilized mankind a recognized bar to the intermarriage of near kin. Instances, indeed, are to be found, as we have noted, where no such impediment is recognized, but these must be considered in the order of extraordinary exceptions. These exceptions must be reckoned also as examples of a perverted moral instinct which may become common to a whole people, as we know it to be found among individuals. And so the habit of incest in the case of the Egyptians was but one form of a depravity to which, as we learn from Lev. XVIII, 3, 21 et seq., these people were addicted. Thus, too, according to Mr. Bancroft, the Kadiaks of Northwestern America, while given to the grossest forms of incest, practiced other unnatural vices.<sup>77</sup>

The Persians, however, beyond the custom of marrying their own mothers, did not show signs of being possessed of a more vitiated moral sense than other nations of antiquity. The

<sup>76</sup> Andrew Martin Fairbairn, "The Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 204.

<sup>77</sup> Hubert Howe Bancroft, "The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America," Vol. I, pp. 81-82.

irregular unions which they learned to form from their foreign priests were, no doubt, originally practiced by the Magi through an overweening desire to keep religious traditions pure from strange and unfriendly influences. The declaration of Mr. McLennan that such marriages were "those of hordes who consecrated an incestuous promiscuity into a system"<sup>8</sup> is seen from what we have said of these unions to be absolutely contrary to historical fact.

JOHN WEBSTER MELODY.

---

<sup>8</sup> McLennan, "Primitive Marriage," p. 223.

RE

Old  
and  
so m  
are  
exp  
proc  
tries  
tion  
Chr  
actu  
can  
sup

out  
emi  
a p  
hol  
bee  
tion  
sho  
acc  
our  
wea  
Chr  
"It  
age  
its  
ing  
thi  
pol  
un  
the  
WI

## RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN THE UNITED STATES.

Among all the differences between the United States and the Old World by far the most salient is the separation of Church and State in the former. Perhaps, too, on no other point are we so much misunderstood by the latter. Our customs in this matter are regarded as the outcome of religious indifference and the expression of hostility of the State towards the Church; as the product of atheistic theorists who seek to level all other countries down to our measurements. Neither one of these suppositions is true. Americans yield to no people in religious, nay, Christian zeal. The State in separating from the Church is actuated very largely by friendliness, believing that the Church can best attend to its own affairs without that governmental support which is only too often more of a hindrance than a help.

Nor is separation of Church and State with us the outcome or the expression of any abstract theory. It is pre-eminently a *fact*. True! there are theorists among us. But as a people we are practical at least so far as we do not believe in holding on to a system of government after that system has been found impracticable. Our European cousins call us a "nation of shop-keepers." They will also admit that we keep our shops in very good order. For the sake of argument, we may accept the description. It will aid considerably in explaining our differences. As Mr. Bryce says in his "American Commonwealth" (II, 575), one of the causes of our separation of Church and State lies in our *commercial* view of the State. "It is more like a commercial company . . . for the management of certain business in which all who reside within its bounds are interested . . . but for the most part leaving the shareholders to themselves. That an organization of this kind should trouble itself otherwise than as a matter of police with the opinions or conduct of its members would be as unnatural as for a railway company to enquire how many of the shareholders were total abstainers." Now one step farther. What has made us so practical? The imperfections of Old

World theories. Without asserting that a union of Church and State is a false theory or inapplicable under any conditions, Americans severally hold that such a theory has not been so uniformly successful as to warrant a blind acceptance of it under all conditions. If this be commercialism, shop-keeping, then it were high time for some of our critics to lay aside their imperial insignia and don working clothes.

The historical origin and progress of this new element in civilization, must therefore claim close and sympathetic study. Judged by theory we will be misunderstood because we are pre-eminently a fact, a stupendous fact, and can be appreciated correctly only as a fact. In the book<sup>1</sup> before us the reader will find an extremely interesting and able sketch of the origin of separation of Church and State in America as well as of its historical connection with the struggle for political independence. The author is well equipped for the work. His research-work has been vast; the arrangement of the same is lucid; the style is pleasant; and, best of all, his treatment of such a delicate question is eminently fair and courteous to all parties concerned. Defects there are, but not many. The title of the book, for instance, is unhappy, because "liberty" is a word susceptible of so many and varied meanings, and in fact, the author himself seems rather ill at ease in his attempt in the opening chapter to define it. "Separation of Church and State" would have been a more felicitous title. His admiration for Roger Williams is rather exaggerated and he is incorrect in stating (p. 482) that Rhode Island never "admitted into statute or practice any spirit of repression," since it is well known that Catholics were disfranchised at least by 1728 if not earlier. Finally, the estimate of the influence of Jonathan Edwards (pp. 485-9) is so exaggerated as to border on the absurd. It is surely astounding to hear that Edwards exerted a more profound influence on the minds of men than "any other man since Luther," and that in theology "he made a place for his name along with those of Augustine and Calvin." But these defects are few and pardonable in a way. On the whole the author has written an excellent work which we

<sup>1</sup> "The Rise of Religious Liberty in America," by Sanford H. Cobb, 8vo, pp. xx and 541, Macmillan, New York, 1902.



cordially commend and whose conclusions we accept in the main.

1. *Colonial Beginnings*.—The growth of religious liberty (by which words we mean separation of State and Church) in America was slow. The early settlers, be it remembered, were all Europeans; hence, they reflected the views of Europeans. Now in the early part of the seventeenth century, union of Church and State was the still generally accepted theory and practice. Nevertheless, a counter movement had set in. Thomas More a century earlier had described in *Utopia* a different condition of affairs. The fratricidal religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had left a feeling of weariness in thinking minds, which found expression in the compromise Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. The cause of religious liberty found more and more open advocates among even such intolerant men as Oliver Cromwell, Sir Henry Vane, and others. So then, there was a double current. The English colonies reflected both. Most of them started out with intolerance, a few with more or less modified toleration.

Hence, several groups are distinguishable. In the first there was a strict union of State and Church. In this group we find Massachusetts, Plymouth, New Haven, Connecticut, and New Hampshire with their congregational establishments; then Virginia and the Carolinas in which the Church of England was established from the very beginning and remained so until the era of the Revolution. It is curious to note the different motives of "establishment" in these sub-groupings. In the northern colonies the union of Church and State was based on the conviction that the State should be religious. In the southern ones it was based on the conviction that the Church was necessarily a department of the State, so that religious dissent was a civil disorder.

A second group is composed of Georgia, Maryland, New York and New Jersey, where changes occurred. Thus Maryland under Catholic rule practiced religious freedom, but under Protestant rule was forced into establishing the Anglican Church. Likewise, the other colonies accepted the same establishment with more or less completeness.

A last group comprises Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and the latter's off-shoot, Delaware, in which colonies no Church was ever established, and in which religious intolerance had the least sway.

But in none of the colonies was there absolute religious equality before the law during all of their course. We can grant, for argument's sake, that Rhode Island, for a long while after the foundation of Providence in 1636, taught and practised religious equality. Yet, it is undeniable that later on (certainly by 1728-9) Catholics were disfranchised. And, speaking of Rhode Island, we note in passing our conviction that Maryland preceded it as well as all others in the practice of religious liberty, although the adverse circumstances in which Lord Baltimore found himself placed prevented him from expressly, and in so many words embodying it in his Maryland charter of 1632. However, a comparison of Williams and Lord Baltimore is, at bottom, somewhat idle, as at best it is a priority of only a few years. Both were undoubtedly great and broad-minded men, pioneers in the cause of religious freedom, though not its originators. A broad view will give credit to both for equal liberality and for having worked out the problem in the best way suitable to each, one as a preacher, the other as a practical man of business, both as founders of colonies.

II. *Subsequent Development.*—The early outlook for liberty was, therefore, none too encouraging, although, even then far brighter than in Europe. Yet, the movement gained ground steadily. It was gaining ground even in old Europe. The almost universal religious indifference characterizing the Europe of the later seventeenth and entire eighteenth centuries, tells plainly enough that men's minds had swung to the opposite extreme of atheism and scepticism out of utter disgust at the religious bickerings of the preceding age. When at Westphalia the opposing troops laid down their weapons, the theologians as well laid down their pens and folio volumes. The age of Voltaire, Du Barry, Bolingbroke and Chesterfield was weary of religion and sought relief in contemptuous agnosticism and grosser epicureanism. America felt the movement. Chiefly in Virginia, where the established Church never was regarded as much more than a department of the

State, and little respected, owing to the scandalous lives of its clergy. In the northern colonies, the minute intolerance of such governments as Massachusetts had disgusted even its own admirers. The "Blue Laws" gradually lapsed into desuetude and became objects of contempt. The experiment of a theocracy, modelled on the Old Testament, had proved an utter and inglorious failure. Meanwhile, in little neighboring Rhode Island, the "lively experiment" (as Charles II called it) of a separation of Church and State had proved itself not only a success but a blessing.

Above all, it should be remembered that the colonies were settled, almost universally, in the North by religious refugees from European persecution. At first, indeed, few of them learned the lesson of toleration from their own sufferings. But later on, that lesson was sure to impress itself, grow clearer and clearer, in proportion as their very diversity of religious conviction rendered a union of Church and State satisfactory to none but the dominant faction. Out of the very necessity of facts the idea sprang. A few theorists there were like Williams. But to the most the problem presented itself as a *practical* one, as a condition of affairs that demanded immediate solution.

Another motive lay in the absurd attempt at a general establishment of the Church of England by the appointment of colonial bishops, a fact which is intimately connected with the political struggle for independence. To understand this, it should be remembered that there were no bishops of the Church of England resident in the colonies. This naturally led to a complete disorganization of it, even in the colonies like Virginia, where it was the established Church. In consequence, appeal after appeal was made to England to have bishops appointed. The appeal seemed reasonable enough at first sight, and no one would have questioned it if he were convinced that it was a question affecting only the internal affairs of the Anglican Church. As a matter of fact, it did affect every resident in the colony, Catholic and Dissenter no less than Anglican, and after this fashion.

Bishops so appointed would become *ipso facto* members of the Anglican State-Church in England. Now, a bishop in England was an officer of the State. Parliament appointed and

removed him at will, and sustained him out of public taxation, and often endowed him with important civil powers—like a “Bishop of Durham.” So then the appointment of an Anglican bishop became involved in the ever-increasing quarrel between the colonies and the home government. The former objected to such appointments of bishops for precisely the same reasons that it objected to the tax on tea: *i. e.*, such appointments would be made by Parliament without any representation on the part of the colonists (pp. 474 and 475). Of course, there were other reasons for this attitude of hostility. Such were the memories of what the colonists’ forefathers had suffered in England at the hands of Anglican bishops. But the main cause was political, as is proved by the fact that the opposition to Anglican bishops ceased as soon as the winning of political independence rendered vain any lingering fear that these bishops would have any political power.

Another reason for believing the agitation chiefly political lies in the attitude of the episcopal clergy on the political questions at issue between the home government and the colonies. The clergy were uncompromising Tories. They were staunch supporters of Parliament, and frowned upon all attempts of the colonies to maintain their right to representation. There foremost members openly admitted that the enmity towards Parliament and King was necessarily bound up with antipathy towards the Anglican establishment. Certainly the Anglican Church was a bitter and irreconcilable enemy of American independence, so far as its clergy were concerned. Its laity, be it said to their honor, were not generally in sympathy with its misguided clergy.

Thus, the cause of independence, or American Democracy, was indissolubly linked with that of American separation of Church and State. They had a common origin, a common history, and, we venture to predict, will have a common fate. “Fear of the Church of England,” said John Adams, “contributed as much as any other cause to arouse the attention, not only of the inquiring mind, but of the common people, and urged them to close thinking on the constitutional authority of Parliament over the Colonies” (pp. 478-9).

III. *The Revolution.*—It is not surprising, therefore, to find that political independence from England almost necessarily drew after it religious liberty, despite the fact that traces of religious bigotry still marred the constitutions and statute-books of some of the States. The movement in favor of liberty in matters of conscience had advanced a long distance during the century and a half intervening between the earliest colonization and the War of Independence. Colony after colony had fallen in with it, so that its ultimate complete success was now assured. But old ideas and customs die hard, and the spirit of religious intolerance fought to the last ditch, nor is it yet lifeless. There was still enough life in it to make it an absorbing issue when the new states came to consider the Federal Constitution in 1787. It is interesting to note exactly how far each state had advanced at that date.

“By brief grouping of them it appears that in only two out of thirteen was full and perfect freedom conceded by law. These were Rhode Island and Virginia. Six of the states, viz., New Hampshire, Connecticut, New Jersey, the two Carolinas and Georgia, insisted on Protestantism. Two were content with the Christian religion; Delaware and Maryland. Four—Pennsylvania, Delaware and the Carolinas—required assent to the divine inspiration of the Bible. Two—Pennsylvania and South Carolina—demanded a belief in heaven and hell. Three—New York, Maryland, and South Carolina—emphasized belief in one Eternal God. One—Delaware—required assent to the doctrine of the Trinity. And five—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, and South Carolina—adhered to a religious establishment” (Cobb, 504).

It is curious and worthy of note that of these Virginia, which had started out as one of the most intolerant, had now become one of the most tolerant. The reason is worth investigating. It seems to have been due to Virginia's leadership in the struggle for political independence, another fact showing the close historical connection between the two fundamental elements in Americanism—democracy and religious liberty.

The very presence and intolerance of the established Anglican Church rendered the struggle in Virginia unusually bitter and long for the advocates of liberty. The state convention



which met in 1776 for the purpose of formally severing political relations with England adopted, as the sixteenth section of its famous "Bill of Rights," a statement according equal rights to all religions. This was the beginning of disestablishment, though the end did not come until the passing of the "Declaratory Act" of 1785.

The chief interest, however, in the study of this struggle in Virginia, lies in the personnel of the advocates of religious liberty. They were all the very men most prominent in the contemporary struggle for political liberty—Madison, Patrick Henry, Jefferson, R. H. Lee, Marshall and Washington. Patrick Henry presented the above-mentioned section of the Bill of Rights. Madison offered to it the amendment which left no loophole for the introduction of intolerance. Jefferson, of course, was a leader here as in all else, and he plunged with his accustomed impassioned eloquence into what he called "the severest struggles in which I have ever been engaged," Washington, Lee, and Marshall were ranged with him, though not perhaps, as radical. They approved a bill providing for a general assessment for the support of Christianity, but allowing everyone to signify to what church he wished his contribution paid. Probably it was meant as a compromise. But it was defeated by Jefferson and Madison on the obvious ground that it made Christianity the religion of the state to the oppression of all non-Christians. At all events, it is striking to find the great leaders in the political revolution substantially agreeing on and fighting for religious liberty. It is not surprising, therefore, to find religious liberty laid down as a fundamental of the American Constitution, drawn up in 1789 by these same leaders in the political struggle for independence.

When the Constitution was submitted to the states for approval in 1787, it contained this sole reference to religion: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." By most of the states this was not regarded as a sufficient protection of religious rights. Massachusetts alone regarded it as too liberal, for the spirit of Cotton Mather was yet abroad in that land of intolerance. The Puritan still shuddered at the idea that "Roman Catholics, Papists, and Pagans might be introduced

into C  
lished  
was C  
unlim  
Cong  
vario  
ferent  
of con  
the C  
make  
hibit  
gover  
of an  
which  
quain  
come,  
with  
states  
State,  
hensi  
their  
Here  
fact.  
exper  
embod  
IV  
that t  
1789,  
its ad  
ferred  
tain i  
bestow  
religio  
so lon  
not in  
its pr  
nation  
to stop  
chang



into office, and that Popery and the Inquisition may be established in America." But this one solitary cry for intolerance was drowned by the otherwise universal demand for a more unlimited freedom of religious observance. When the First Congress of the United States assembled, it considered the various amendments to the Constitution proposed by the different state conventions. Many of these concerned the rights of conscience. As a result Congress accepted, and put first into the Constitution the amendment reading: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Thus, so far as the general government is concerned, the last relics of religious intolerance, of an established Church, were swept away by a few words which are majestic in their simple dignity. To one unacquainted with the varying struggles of which they are the outcome, they may seem meagre. But when we compare them with the verbose and awkward attempts made by the separate states to express their opposition to a union of Church and State, we are forced to admire their profundity and comprehensiveness. They are the "Requiem" of intolerance, and by their brevity express what is no longer, rather than what was. Here is no verbiage, but in simple words a simple and a great fact. It is the formula in which, after a century and a half of experiment, the friends of religious liberty thought best to embody their principles.

IV. *The Last Remnants.*—We would do well to remember that the adoption of religious freedom by the government in 1789, did not then, and perhaps does not now, necessarily imply its adoption in each particular state. "The Constitution conferred on the general government the right and duty to maintain in every state a republican form of government, but it bestowed no right of interference with the institutions of a religious character which any state might choose to establish, so long as the moral safety and the integrity of the nation were not involved. If, for example, one of the states should set aside its present form of government, and set up a monarchy, the national government under the Constitution would be required to stop such action. But if one of the states, even to-day, should change its own Constitution, and set up a State-Church, with

the perquisites and power of an establishment, and should put such Church upon the public treasury for support, the general government has no power to stop it" (op. cit., p. 510).

As regards the present day, this statement of our author is not so certain as his language implies. It is certain beyond all doubt that the men of 1789 did so interpret the Constitution. But the powers of Congress have grown considerably since then. It interferes in many affairs of even lesser importance than those affecting religious liberty which a century ago were regarded as out of its scope, and a union of Church and State is so intensely abhorrent to the American mind, so opposed to all that we call Americanism, that most Americans, it is certain, would hold that Congress would be amply justified in the use of federal force to prevent the establishment of a Church in any part of the country.

The fact remains, however, that our forefathers did not consider the abolition of religious intolerance by the general government in 1789 tantamount to its abolition by state governments. "Each state was free to do as it willed in regard to the Church, individual liberty of worship, establishment, religious taxation, and religious tests. They carried over into their future statehood the special institutions obtaining in 1789, and used their own time and method of making what changes they desired. For this cause, though full freedom was the law of the nation, yet in some parts of the union, illiberal and oppressive restrictions obtained for many years, attended by more or less of struggle, until the last vestige of old distinctions was swept away: if indeed, it can be said that they are all gone even yet" (op. cit., *ibid.*).

A few instances will illustrate the tenaciousness of the old traditions. Especially in Connecticut was the last struggle most interesting, both because of its intensity and of the light which it throws upon the relation between democracy and religious equality. Not until after 1818 was the Church disestablished there. One of the chief reasons why it existed so long was the support accorded it by the Federalists, whom it were more correct to term conservatives. Under their influence religious liberty actually became more restricted. Like so many conservatives of to-day, they confounded religious liberty with

the a  
Revo  
polit  
ernm  
wher  
tide  
error  
the d  
dent  
In  
a lon  
until  
death  
had s  
peris  
ents  
befor  
that  
Chur  
in m  
min  
thoug  
happ  
the U  
own  
the c  
natur  
was  
its o  
lish  
intro  
the n  
T  
old i  
now  
true,  
tutio  
very  
Nev

the atheism and all the other outrageous exercises of the French Revolution, forgetful that the very same consequences in the political order could be urged by the reactionaries in civil government—the Tories, the Bourbons, the Bonapartists. Even when their feeble efforts were unavailing to stem the irresistible tide of liberty they gave up the struggle “hugging the dear error to the last.” “To many the change seemed to portend the day of doom. The venerable Timothy Dwight, the president of Yale, deprecated it until his death” (op. cit., p. 513).

In Massachusetts the disestablishment of the Church was a long process. An amusing incident hastened its end. Not until 1833 was the Church completely disestablished. The death-blow was given to it by the very weapon with which it had so long destroyed its enemies. By a curious irony of fate it perished by a law of its own making, a fact which all adherents of a union of Church and State would do well to remember before attempting to put their theories into practice. It seems that the Massachusetts Constitution gave to towns, and not to Churches, the right to elect the minister in the last resort. Now in many localities the old orthodox Church had become a minority as the result of the rapid increase of Unitarianism, though still containing control of affairs wherever the minister happened to be orthodox. But when a new election came off, the Unitarian majority of the town elected a minister of their own persuasion over the orthodox minority in actual control of the Church. The dispute was carried to the courts which naturally stood for the constitutional rights of the town. This was too much for the old theocracy, which saw itself hoist by its own petard. Finally, by 1833, the Church was disestablished. Titles were done away with, the voluntary system was introduced, and the town discharged from all participation in the management of Church affairs.

There are typical instances illustrating the tenacity of the old idea. It gave way slowly, grudgingly, with bad grace. Even now there are a few instances which survive, harmless, it is true, at the present moment, but yet existing. The state constitutions generally enforce religious liberty, although they differ very appreciably in their method of expressing the same. Nevertheless, there are exceptions. “In five states—Arkansas,

Mississippi, Texas, and the Carolinas—no person can hold office who denies the being of Almighty God or the existence of a Supreme Being. Arkansas also makes a denier of God incompetent as a witness. Pennsylvania and Tennessee restrict office to such as believe in God and in a future state of reward and punishment. Maryland requires this belief in a juror or witness, but for the office-holder demands only a belief in God." And yet by a curious inconsistency, two of these states (Mississippi and Tennessee) forbid all religious tests as qualifications for office.

To New Hampshire must be awarded the palm of intolerance. Up to 1881 the Bill of Rights contained this section: "Every denomination of *Protestant* Christians, demeaning themselves quietly and as good subjects of the State, shall be equally under the protection of the law." And the State yet continues to "authorize the *towns* to provide for the support of *Protestant* ministers." Repeated efforts have been made to do away with these last relics of intolerance, but to no avail. As late as 1889, they were retained with characteristic stubbornness, and for all we know, still remain. Of course the law is a dead letter in practice, but, nevertheless, the existence of a sentiment opposed, in theory, to its repeal, is a fact which may well call for some concern on the part of New Hampshire citizens who are not Protestant. Stranger things than the rehabilitation of supposedly defunct laws have happened in history.

There is, therefore, even at this late day, a difference in the amount of religious liberty guaranteed by the charters of the various states—a verbal difference because just now no state would think of applying any religious restrictions expressed by its Constitution. All, however, would seem to agree on the following points:

"1. No legislature can pass a law establishing religion or a church. To effect such a purpose a change in the Constitution would be required.

"2. No person can be compelled by law to attend any form of religious service; or

"3. To contribute to the support of any such service or Church.

"4. No restraint can be put by law on the free exercise of religion; or

"5. On the free expression and promulgation of religious belief. Provided always that this freedom shall not be construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state" (op. cit., p. 520).

*V. Objections and Dangers.*—It must now be clear to the reader that religious toleration in America is an historical growth, the slow outcome of conditions peculiar to America. It is not the result of experiments based on an abstract theory, but a great fact adopted by a people tentatively, with almost unnecessary caution, after a long and unsuccessful trial of a union of Church and State. It was not forced upon them suddenly by a small band of doctrinaires before they were ready to grapple with the serious problems entailed by it. It needs to be looked on in this light in order to explain away some of its present inconsistencies and objections to it from a theoretical point of view. For there are inconsistencies and there are objections which cannot be brushed aside contemptuously. Our legislators can exclude the products of foreign countries by a tariff, but foreign ideas will always enter freely, will compete and force attention.

To all objections against separation of Church and State from a theoretical point of view, the serious American will answer that they do not touch the question vitally. Surely no one of judgment will question either the philosophical harmony and beauty of an ideal union of Church and State, or the fact that such unions have been beneficial under given conditions. The mere fact that all peoples believed in and practiced such a system up to within comparatively recent times, that even now many peoples do continue to live under it, is ample reason to restrain a sweeping condemnation of it. But theory very seldom disconcerts the American man. He accepts the opposite fact. He has lived under a different system for over a century, finds that it works very harmoniously despite an occasional hitch, and has firmly made up his mind to bitterly resent and unflinchingly oppose anything or anybody seeking to disturb the present state of affairs.

Objections touching upon facts require usually very detailed answers, even when the former presuppose ignorance.



A very common objection is that separation of Church from the State means persecution of the Church and atheism or indifference in the State. Such a conclusion is warranted neither by logic nor facts. The State declines to interfere in Church affairs, not because it is irreligious but because, from past experience, it has found out its incapacity to do so with good results to either, because the diversity of religious opinions renders union impracticable. The framers of the Constitution were, almost to a man, Christians, God-fearing and pious, after their own fashion. Infidelity or indifference were, with casual exceptions, abhorred by the leaders of the American Revolution. And, if facts alone can teach, then assuredly the sad condition of affairs in countries like France and Italy, where officially a union of Church and State exists, is eloquent enough to dispense with comment.

Indeed, many of our leading legists maintain that Christianity is "in a certain sense and for certain purposes . . . part of the law of the land." While this will allow for a diversity of opinion, all will accept without hesitation the tribute of De Tocqueville uttered sixty years ago: "There is no country in the whole world in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America" (op. cit., p. 525). Certainly there is no country in the whole world where the true Church is more vigorous than, or even as vigorous as it is in the United States. Americans, therefore, indignantly repudiate the charge of irreligion, however much there does exist among us a hopeless diversity of religious beliefs. This, by-the-way, is not of our own making, but a European inheritance.

This answer suggests the counter-objection of inconsistency. It is argued that if Christianity be the law of the land, what becomes of our boasted separation of Church and State. Add, moreover, our inconsistency in enacting laws for the observance of Sunday, the exemption of Church property from taxation, thanksgiving day proclamations, punishment of blasphemy, etc.

Now this is, indeed, a serious difficulty. The common answer to it is awkward. It says that the State looks upon the Church as a *social* institution, on religion of some sort as necessary to its own well-being, and so on. But whilst such a con-



nection between religion and well-being of society is undeniably necessary, this does not turn the point of the charge of inconsistency, for there is no such thing as church *in general* or religion *in general*, at least, in these days. There is not a single fundamental of any church which will be accepted by all others. What one church considers necessary to the well-being of society, another thinks evil. We have only to look upon the attitude of the various churches towards divorce. Thus the State is forced to adopt some principles of government which are denied by certain churches and accepted by others: this done, there is *ipso facto* a union of Church and State "in a certain sense." Thus a Jew can logically infer from the existence of our Sunday laws that this is a Christian State, and that he does not enjoy complete religious freedom if he is obliged to cease work on that day.

Again. Has not every persecutor that ever lived persecuted chiefly on the ground that the Church was a *social* institution? that heresy was a social menace, a political peril? Catholics were persecuted in England, the Huguenots in France because of political expediency. Old Rome slaughtered the Christians, because they were held enemies of the State.

Such answers, then, do not meet the difficulty. The only answer which seems reasonable is, strange to say, to admit the objection. We are inconsistent, but necessarily so. Only we do not admit that part of the objection which pre-supposes that Christianity is theoretically the law of the land. For, if Christianity be the law of the land, then what is Christianity? Is it Catholicity or Protestantism? and what is to prevent a Protestant majority from concluding that Protestantism is the law of the land? Hence, the use of the Protestant Bible and prayers in the public schools, and other conclusions. Our Puritan predecessors made Christianity the law of the land, and we Catholics know full well what that meant. Indeed, Christianity is no more the law of the land in theory than is Buddhism. But this is true, namely, that our laws are penetrated with the spirit of Christianity, that Americans, with some exceptions, are, as a nation, Christians, and live as Christians.

Now to the very *crux* of the difficulty. Are we inconsistent, *i. e.*, in passing Sunday Laws? It seems to me that we are, yet

we are forced to be so. The nation is, as a unit, Christian, and Christians as a unit observe Sunday. To make an exception for the sake of a few Jews is to expect too much from human nature, to push a theory to a ridiculous conclusion. As already emphasized, religious liberty in America is more of a fact than a theory. Were we dreamy doctrinaires, fierce apostles of a system, we should push separation of Church and State to some very unpleasant conclusions. But we are, above all, a practical people, inclined, therefore, to use with discretion, an institution that, for us at least, makes for peace and harmony. Our very inconsistency proves our good sense.

A last word as to the dangers ahead of us. Are there any? We think so, though at present they may seem distant and indistinct. The relations between Church and State are swaying in a delicate adjustment, which the slightest untoward movement can disturb. There are so many things, partly religious partly civil, that belong at once to both domains. The question of taxation for schools, appropriations for hospitals under religious control, appointments of army and navy chaplains—all these require infinite delicacy and tact in the handling. A blunder might at any time precipitate a crisis or establish precedents which would allow for the silent, insidious entrance of the principles of union of Church and State. Then, too, a heavy discount must ever be made for the tendency in human nature to grow tired of the same thing, no matter how excellent in itself, the yet greater tendency to grasp at power of any kind, the necessarily constantly increasing wealth of untaxed religious corporations tending to throw taxation upon civil entities, the presence in our midst of a not inconsiderable number of persons who secretly wish for a change of affairs because they are men of no country, the change in democratic ideas as the result of imperialistic expansion—these are but some of the grave dangers which every serious American must be aware of.

How shall we meet the problems of the future? With good sense, tact, charity, honesty, patience. Above all, with a knowledge of history. The writer can only repeat again, that separation of Church and State was not the outcome of a theory and does not exist as a theory. It is a fact now, and was the outcome of facts. It will be preserved chiefly by realizing this its

nature of fact. We do not need to repeat that the *theory* of a union of Church and State is as harmonious as the *theory* of their separation. It is only in the light of facts, of history, that the differences of merit appear. The prisons of the Inquisition, the fires of Smithfield, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the blood of Catholic Irishmen flowing like water in the streets of Drogheda and Wexford, the unspeakable atrocities of the Thirty Years' War, the fanatic Titus Oates and Gordon riots, the witch-fires and duck-ponds of Salem, the Kultur-kampf, the present enslavement of the Church in European countries—this it is which makes an American love his country above all others as that wherein one may love God without hating his neighbor; these living historical memories alone will preserve him from any repetition of the errors of the dead and cruel past.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE, BALTIMORE, MD.

## RELIGION AS A CREDIBLE DOCTRINE.

In a series of articles recently published in the *Fortnightly Review*, Mr. Mallock has undertaken to furnish us with an accurate estimate of the relative positions occupied by Religion and Science at the dawn of the twentieth century.<sup>1</sup> He proposes to investigate the intellectual accounts, both of theologians and of "leaders of science when they speak in the capacity of philosophers," and to formulate an intelligible statement of the respective assets and liabilities of the scientific philosopher who denies religion, and of the theologic philosopher who defends it. By religion Mr. Mallock means, not some particular system of worship, but simply Ethical Theism—"the essence, the vital epitome of religion" is comprised in the "doctrines of God, freedom and immortality," which are the basic ideas of Theistic Dualism. Three men, owing to their recognized ability as Theistic apologists, Father Gerard, Father Maher and Dr. W. G. Ward, have been singled out by Mr. Mallock, to bear the brunt of his attack on the Theistic position.

Opposed to Theistic Dualism is the doctrine of Evolutionary Monism, which Mr. Mallock is pleased to call scientific philosophy. This theory maintains that, "in the primitive nebula out of which the existing universe arose, was contained the potency of everything which the universe contains now, including life and all its phenomena—human, no less than animal reason. Besides the forces, qualities and materials contained in the primordial nebula, no other causes are required to explain the universe." Professor Haeckel is chosen by Mr. Mallock, as the ablest exponent of this theory.

In his rôle of intellectual accountant for Theistic Dualism and Evolutionary Monism, Mr. Mallock expects to show "that the scientific philosophers are correct in their methods and arguments—that the attempts of contemporary theologians to find flaws in the case of their opponents, or to convert the discoveries of science into proofs of their own theism, are exercises

<sup>1</sup> Since these pages were penned Mr. Mallock's articles have been embodied in a book entitled "Religion as a Credible Doctrine" (Macmillan).

of an ingenuity wholly and hopelessly misapplied." But he is not going to stop here. He proposes to establish that, in spite of the onslaught of science, we can find, in the fact of moral responsibility, sufficient ground for maintaining the doctrine of Theistic Dualism. To the former proposition, viz., that Evolutionary Monism is in accord with scientific knowledge, while Theistic Dualism is not, Mr. Mallock devotes most of his attention, and it is with this contention alone that we are concerned in the present paper.

It is to be deplored that at the very outset Mr. Mallock introduces into the discussion a source of interminable confusion. The terms, "man of science," "scientific philosopher," and "monist" are used interchangeably. The monistic doctrine of substance is declared to be a scientific theory. "Science," we are told, "leads us to a conception of matter or the universal substance nearly approaching to that of Spinoza." "Science is opposed to religion . . . as a monistic doctrine to a dualistic." The limits of confusion seem to be reached when Mr. Mallock repeatedly uses the term, "science" in two different significations in the same sentence. For example, he speaks of "Fr. Maher's endeavors to prove against science on *its* own ground, that man possesses a life independent of the life of the body." Here the term science obviously refers, in the first instance, to the speculations of evolutionary Monism; and secondly, to a systematized body of rigorously verified facts. This confusion of thought and terms pervades the whole series of articles, and has thoroughly obscured the original issue. Further, Mr. Mallock, instead of auditing the accounts of Monism and Dualism in the light of science, devotes his energies mainly to showing that Theists cannot prove the existence of an Ethical God solely from the data of physical science—a feat which no theist ever attempted to perform. In a word, Mr. Mallock begins by assuming that Evolutionary Monism is a scientific doctrine, and ends by elaborately proving that it is opposed to Theistic Dualism.

Mr. Mallock's statements of the doctrines of Monism and of Ethical Theism may be accepted as satisfactory. But in order to avoid Mr. Mallock's fatal confusion, we shall follow tradi-

tional usage in defining the domain of science as the "field of rigorously verified fact."

It is important to bear in mind that there is evolution and evolution. The word "evolution," as an *explanation* of the universe, expresses nothing until we know whether Theistic or Atheistic evolution is meant. With the former we have here no concern, for Mr. Mallock's evolution is the evolution of Professor Haeckel, who boasts that he has rendered the "God hypothesis" superfluous. The question then which confronts us is not whether evolution be scientific, but whether atheistic evolution be in accord with science.

In this paper it will conduce to clearness to discuss the problems at issue, not in the order which Mr. Mallock follows, but in the order which most naturally presents itself, viz., the origin of the universe; the genesis of life; the evolution of life-forms; the spirituality of the human soul, and finally, freedom of the will.

To begin with the beginning: the monistic concept of the origin of the universe is in irreconcilable opposition to the physical doctrine of entropy or the dissipation of energy—a doctrine our knowledge of which is due chiefly to Lord Kelvin. This law is stated by Professor Haeckel in these words: "As the mechanical energy of the universe is daily being transformed into heat, and this cannot be reconverted into mechanical energy, all difference of temperature must ultimately disappear, and the completely latent heat must be equally distributed through one inert mass of motionless matter." When Father Gerard pertinently points out that Monism is hopelessly at variance with this well authenticated conclusion of science, Mr. Mallock jauntily dismisses Father Gerard's strictures by asking in what way is the theory of entropy inconsistent with the doctrine of inorganic evolution. If Mr. Mallock refers to Theistic Evolution, the question is obviously irrelevant. But if he means to ask: How is the scientific doctrine of entropy opposed to Monistic Evolution, we shall let that "most eminent and thoughtful man of science," Professor Haeckel, supply the answer: "If the theory of entropy were true," says Professor Haeckel, "we should have a beginning corresponding to this assumed end of the world. Both ideas are quite untenable in the light of our monistic and consistent theory of the eternal



cosmogenetic process."<sup>1</sup> In other words, Professor Haeckel rejects an authoritative conclusion of physical science because it contradicts Professor Haeckel's philosophical speculations. This method of procedure is thoroughly characteristic of the whole monistic argument, and the denial of the doctrine of entropy is by no means the only example we shall see of the facility with which monists reject the most thoroughly established facts which happen to be out of harmony with their "enlarged cosmological perspective."

The next point to be discussed is the question of the genesis of life. Here we shall find Evolutionary Monism again discredited by physical science. The fundamental proposition of evolutionary philosophy, Professor Huxley tells us, is, "that the whole world, living and non-living, is the result of *mutual interaction*, according to definite laws, of the powers possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity was composed."<sup>2</sup> This proposition, which is fundamental with evolutionary Monists, is utterly unscientific. Professor Tait only voices the verdict of all sane science when he declares: "To say that even the lowest form of life can be fully explained on physical principles alone, *i. e., by the mere relations, motions and interactions* of portions of inanimate matter, is simply unscientific. There is absolutely nothing known in physical science which can lend the slightest support to such an idea."<sup>3</sup> No scientist of note would to-day maintain that there is the slightest shred of experimental evidence supporting the doctrine of abiogenesis.

Now this doctrine of abiogenesis is, as we have been repeatedly told, a cardinal principle with the Monist. Another principle not less essential to the Monist is that all knowledge is worthless which is not based on experience. Still he continues to uphold abiogenesis in spite of the fact that all trustworthy experience tells against it. Contradicted by all science worthy of the name, he continues to proclaim abiogenesis a philosophical necessity:<sup>4</sup> either, he says, spontaneous generation took

<sup>1</sup> "Riddle of the Universe," p. 247.

<sup>2</sup> On the Reception of the Origin of Species, "Life of C. Darwin," p. 201.

<sup>3</sup> *Contemporary Review*, January, 1878.

<sup>4</sup> In marked contrast to this unscientific frame of mind is the attitude of Professor Brooks. Speaking of life, he says: "While we know nothing of its

place ages ago, or else there is some power distinct from the forces of inorganic nature, which produced life on the earth. But the latter supposition he holds to be inadmissible and absurd, as is proven by a mere reference to "our monistic cosmological perspective." Surely, a system that employs this kind of reasoning has forfeited all claims to be considered either scientific or philosophic.

In his eagerness to eliminate this vital discrepancy between monism and science, Mr. Mallock resorts to very peculiar tactics. Instead of meeting the dualist argument that there is demonstrably involved in all organic life a principle which is absent from inorganic matter, he conveniently denies that the problem of the origin of life has any bearing on the truth of Ethical Theism: "As far as the practical controversy between religion and science is concerned, the issue here raised is altogether illusory." But, if science disproves a fundamental tenet of Monism it is difficult to understand Mr. Mallock's assertion that "Science is opposed to religion as a monistic doctrine to a dualistic." If, as he says, the conflict between science and religion is resolvable into a conflict between monism and dualism, then it would seem that a disproof of monism in a basic doctrine should bear very directly on the "practical controversy between religion and science." What Mr. Mallock's contention here amounts to is simply this: the disproof of monism does not establish the existence of an ethical God. To disprove abiogenesis, he explains, is merely to establish a dualism between fermented liquor and unfermented; between beer and water. "How far," he asks, "should we be on the road to vindicating religion with God for one of our terms and beer or *vin ordinaire* for the other?" This is really unworthy of Mr. Mallock. He rejects an argument because it fails to prove what it was never intended to prove. He seems to have forgotten that, as he himself has already pointed out, the theistic apologists are here trying to establish the existence not of an ethical God, but of a living Creator. "The real question at issue," says Father Dris-

nature or origin and must guard against any unproved assumption, there seem from the present standpoint to be insuperable objections to the view that this agency is either matter or energy." "We are told that the belief that it has at some time arisen from the properties of inorganic matter is a logical necessity, but the only logical necessity is that where our knowledge ends we should confess our ignorance." *Science*, April 5, 1895.

coll, as quoted by Mr. Mallock, "is the existence of a living Creator"; and Mr. Mallock adds, "Father Maher says precisely the same thing."

From the problem of the origin of life, we pass on to the question of the evolution of living beings. "Undoubtedly," says Father Gerard, to whom Mr. Mallock now directs his attention, "we find that the history of life on earth has been a history of evolution—that is to say the scheme of vegetable and animal life as we know it has been gradually unfolded in a progression of types from lower to higher, the same general lines of structure being elaborated to greater and greater perfection." For the explanation of this process of evolution there are two hypotheses and only two in the field. Of these one is intelligent design manifested in creation. The other is natural selection operating through countless ages of the past. The former is the explanation offered by Theistic Dualism. The latter is the theory of Evolutionary Monism. Professor Haeckel calls the struggle for life "the great selective divinity by which a purely natural choice without preconceived design creates new forms, just as selective man creates new types by an artificial choice with definite design." And the most glorious achievement of the Darwinian theory of natural selection, he assures us, is that it gave us the solution of the great philosophical problem, how can purposive contrivances be produced by merely mechanical processes without design? The Darwinian theory of natural selection is, then, the basis of the monistic concept of the Universe. But here again scientific investigation has been unfavorable to such a conception. "Serious objections have presented themselves," as Father Gerard points out, "difficulties have accumulated, till now as we have been told, the natural selection theory has sunk beneath the rank even of an hypothesis." This statement Mr. Mallock challenges with a direct denial: "Whether the theory of natural selection be a true theory or not, the scientific world of to-day have not agreed to abandon it." In considering this assertion we should remember that Darwinian natural selection is a theory explaining purposive adaptations on purely mechanical grounds, and that in a teleological view of evolution natural selection is simply a factor supporting or accelerating the process. Now, Mr. Mal-

lock's statement that the purely mechanical theory of natural selection is still in repute among scientists, is to say the least, interesting. We might quote indefinitely the views of individual scientists to the contrary, were it not rendered unnecessary by the appearance of a recent publication of high authority. We refer to the work by Dr. E. Dennert, entitled, "*Vom Sterbelager des Darwinismus.*" After quoting the views of dozens of naturalists, zoologists, biologists, who are opposed to the Darwinian philosophy, Dr. Dennert, speaking of the actual status of the present controversy, has this to say: "It cannot be denied that Darwinism, in the sense of natural selection by means of the struggle for existence, is being crowded to the wall all along the line. The bulk of modern scientists no longer recognizes it, and those who have not yet discarded it, at any rate regard it as of subordinate importance. In place of this, older views have again come into acceptance, which do not deny development, but maintain that this was not purely a mechanical process. . . . A survey of the field shows that Darwinism in its old form is becoming a matter of history, and that we are actually witnessing its death struggle." We cannot be expected to admit as ultimate the mechanical explanation of the universe when the theory on which it is based is openly or tacitly rejected by men of science as insufficient. The structure of Evolutionary Monism indeed, remains, but its scientific foundation is admittedly gone. "What is it, then," Father Gerard may well ask, "but a mere castle in the air?"

After a vain chase from star-dust to animal sentience in search of a solitary instance in which science either sustains Evolutionary Monism or contradicts Theistic Dualism, Mr. Mallock brings the religious apologist up short with the thesis: "The religious doctrine of man stands or falls . . . with the establishment of a difference between animal life and human." Here two questions are involved, viz: the spirituality of the human soul and the freedom of the will. As the most capable exponent of the former doctrine, Father Maher is singled out for attack; for a similar reason Dr. W. G. Ward is taken to task on the latter.

The traditional scholastic arguments for the spirituality of the soul are presented by Father Maher with unusual clearness.

The human soul, he tells us, exercises activities which transcend the powers of any agent intrinsically dependent on matter. A most obvious example of such an activity is the intellectual act of apprehending abstract, universal and necessary truths, or the act of perceiving rational relations between ideas, and the logical sequence of conclusions from premises. Moreover, the reflex operation exhibited in self-consciousness cannot be the act of a faculty essentially dependent on a corporeal agent. The act of reflexion is in absolute contradiction with the essential nature of matter. The intellectual operations of the soul are thus seen to be independent of matter. And as we may logically argue from the nature of the activity to the nature of the agent, we conclude that the soul, as the source of spiritual activities, must also be spiritual.

Now what is the value of all these arguments? "I shall point out," says Mr. Mallock, "that they are all of them equally inconclusive: that they ignore facts which are obvious, assume facts which are unprovable—and that in a still more striking manner, the more important of them contradict each other." "In the first place," continues Mr. Mallock, "Father Maher's entire appeal is an appeal to the imagination. It amounts to assuming that the unimaginable cannot exist." And as Father Maher himself sees, when it is to his interest, "Imagination is not the test of possibility." Mr. Mallock's explanation of this bit of criticism is hopelessly unintelligible, so entirely has he misunderstood Father Maher's position. To quote his own words: "The unique and unimaginable nature of the phenomena presented by consciousness as associated with matter, is seen and acknowledged by everybody as fully as it is by Father Maher: but he, like everybody else, admits this association is a fact; and the fact that consciousness is associated with matter at all is just as difficult to imagine, and is just as contrary to the analogy of all other phenomena, as would be the fact that consciousness could exist apart from it or that it could not." This is all quite true and at the same time quite irrelevant. There is here no question of imaginability. All the phenomena under consideration are unimaginable. The problem is one of metaphysics, and amounts to this: Find a sufficient cause for the intellectual activities of man. A careful analysis of the



phenomena involved shows that no material organ can possibly be such a cause as is required. That spiritual operations should have their source in a material substance is not only unimaginable, but, in the strictest sense, inconceivable.

Mr. Mallock's whole objection comes from supposing that Father Maher argues from the simplicity, *i. e.*, quantitative nonextension, of the soul, to its spirituality, *i. e.*, independence of matter. That this is his view of his opponent's position is evidenced from the dilemma in which he fancies Father Maher has placed himself. "If the non-spatial intellect must be essentially independent of the spatial brain, why is the non-spatial consciousness of the brute not likewise essentially independent of its material organ?" In each case the chasm between matter and consciousness is for the imagination and the intellect equally impassable." "The whole argument from the contrariety between conscious life and matter is therefore wholly valueless. It either shows that animals are immortal, which Father Maher denies; or it does nothing to show that man is." With most perverse ingenuity, Mr. Mallock has here introduced a source of confusion which has concealed from him the weakness of his own objection. When this confusion is removed the solution of his dilemma will neither be difficult nor far to seek. His entire difficulty arises from a failure to distinguish between the simplicity and the spirituality of the soul, and between the proofs by which each is established. Yet this elementary distinction is indicated by Father Maher with the greatest precision: "By saying a substance is simple we mean that it is not the resultant or product of separate factors or parts. By affirming that it is spiritual we signify that in its existence, and to some extent in its operations, it is independent of matter. The principle of life in the lower animal was held by the schoolmen to be, in this sense, an example of a simple principle which is nevertheless not spiritual since it is altogether dependent on the organism, or as they said, 'completely immersed in matter.'"<sup>1</sup>

From the non-extended character of sentiency, whether in man or animals, nothing can be established as regards the soul except its simplicity. And no scholastic, least of all Father

<sup>1</sup> "Psychology," p. 469.

Mal  
from  
of m  
its c  
only  
inde  
it p  
acti  
beli  
the  
org  
we  
mat  
tinc  
as n

the  
bru  
app  
he v  
But  
psy  
nen  
anim  
pow  
ope  
spin  
arg  
plet  
lish  
arg  
ope  
dep  
soul

so-ca  
are i  
and  
logic



Maheer, ever dreamed of proving the spirituality of the soul from this source. If the simple soul be essentially independent of matter it is said to be spiritual; if it depends on matter for its existence it is said to be non-spiritual or material. Now the only way in which we can judge whether the soul is essentially independent of matter or not, is by a study of its operations. If it puts forth activities which are entirely in accord with the activities, *i. e.*, properties, of matter, we have no reason to believe that it is essentially independent of matter. But if, on the other hand, its operations transcend the power of a material organ and radically contradict every known property of matter, we are justified in holding it to be essentially independent of matter, *i. e.*, spiritual. With the mere explanation of this distinction Mr. Mallock's objections become not so much irrelevant as meaningless.

We scarcely need refer to Mr. Mallock's attempt to prove the spirituality of the brute soul. If he were to show that the brute exercises spiritual activities, *e. g.*, that the brute can apprehend necessary truths, or is capable of self-consciousness, he would be entitled to conclude that the brute soul is spiritual. But in this matter his reasoning is not in harmony with the best psychological thought of the day. The verdict of the most eminent psychologists is that all the actions of even the higher animals can be explained by assuming them to be endowed with powers analogous to man's sense faculties.<sup>1</sup> And from the operations of man's sense faculties we could never deduce the spirituality of man's soul. Without entering into Mr. Mallock's arguments here, it is sufficient to observe that they are completely beside the question. Even if he were to succeed in establishing his point, it would in no way detract from the theistic argument. The nature of the human soul is deduced from its operations, and its spirituality is conclusively established independently of all speculation as to the nature of the animal soul.

<sup>1</sup> Wundt's testimony may be taken as typical; "The closer analysis of the so-called manifestations of intelligence among animals shows, however, that they are in all cases fully explicable as simple sensible recognitions and associations, and that they lack the characteristics belonging to concepts proper and to logical operations." "Outlines of Psychology," p. 314.

Confident that he has completely demolished Father Maher's arguments of the spirituality of the human soul, Mr. Mallock passes on to the problem of free will. Here, if anywhere, Mr. Mallock is called upon to show most clearly the harmony of evolutionary monism with the facts of positive knowledge, for on this point the universal conviction of mankind absolutely contradicts the fundamental principle of the monistic philosophy. Before we can reasonably be asked to reject this undeniable conviction of the human race—and this is surely "a fact of positive knowledge"—reasons more substantial must be advanced than the mere assertion that Professor Haeckel finds no place for the fact of freedom in his "enlarged cosmological perspective."

"The main grounds," says Mr. Mallock, "on which modern science (sc. monistic philosophy) contends that free will is impossible," are three. First: "The general argument from psychology may be summed up thus: In the absence of motive there can be no act of the will at all. When motives are present will is always determined by the strongest." Second: "Since every act of the will, every motive, feeling or desire has its physical equivalent in some movement or condition of the brain, all mental processes must follow the same laws as those which prevail through the whole physical universe." Third: "This argument comprises a mass of facts which show how the qualities of the individual organism depend on parentage, physical health, climate, and similar circumstances, so that whilst it is the organism which determines the character and will of the individual, it is a multitude of external causes that determine the character of the organism." Let us examine these arguments briefly: The last directly involves a *petitio principii*. It assumes that the organism necessarily determines the character and the will. This is the point at issue. The scientific facts, which show that the qualities of the individual organism depend on heredity and environment, are recognized by the defender of free will quite as fully as by the determinist, but the former utterly repudiates the assumption that the qualities of the organism necessarily determine either character or will. Character, he maintains, is to a great extent, moulded by the will, whilst the will, being the activity of a free cause, is self-deter-

mini  
As r  
natu  
logic  
deter  
phys  
post  
raise  
will  
T  
caus  
not g  
conf  
allow  
hype  
hypo  
the s  
verse  
freed  
endow  
we h  
argum  
W  
will f  
Mr. M  
the ac  
most  
dispr  
ness,  
admit  
pulse  
"A n  
inevit  
intern  
minis  
ating  
accoo  
to the  
ists an

mining. This position he defends by an appeal to experience. As regards the physical sciences, there is not, and by the very nature of the case cannot be, a shred of physical or physiological evidence forthcoming to support the assumption of the determinist. Physiology, we are told by the most eminent physiological psychologists, neither disproves nor verifies the postulate of the free will. Consequently, this postulate must be raised and discussed on other grounds—the problem of the free will belongs to the domain of rational psychology.

The second argument involves a confusion of the law of causation with the uniformity of the laws of nature. We need not go into this question because Mr. Mallock himself freely confesses that the argument is worthless. He tells us: "If we allow ourselves to assume that the brain is influenced by some hyper-physical cause . . . with which it is associated, the hypothesis of this free force does not necessarily contradict the scientific doctrine of the uniformity of the physical universe." Precisely, and no theist ever attempted to explain the freedom of the will on any other assumption than that man is endowed with a hyper-physical soul—the existence of which we have already seen, has been established by incontestable arguments.

We come finally to the consideration of the problem of Free-will from the standpoint of rational psychology. On this point Mr. Mallock directs his attack against Dr. W. G. Ward, who, on the admission of John Stuart Mill, was "one of the clearest and most logical of the English dialecticians of his time." In his disproof of Determinism Dr. Ward, with characteristic clearness, goes directly to the point at issue. He begins with the fact, admitted by everyone, that the spontaneous and unforced impulse of the will is determined by character and circumstances. "A man's spontaneous impulse" he says, "is infallibly and inevitably determined by his entire circumstances external and internal, of the moment." Thus far Dr. Ward and the Determinist agree. But now the question arises: Does preponderating spontaneous impulse always and *necessarily* issue in accordant action? This is the critical point. The answer given to the question must settle the controversy between Determinists and Libertarians. The Determinist must answer the ques-

tion in the affirmative. Dr. Ward rejoins with repeated and emphatic denial. "I am able," he says, "to resist this spontaneous impulse by my soul's intrinsic strength. . . . Consciousness attests unmistakably that I have the power of resisting my preponderating spontaneous impulse. . . . It is a matter of unmistakable certainty that at this moment the spontaneous *impulse* of my will is in one direction and the *act* of my will is in the opposite direction"—"It is an undeniable fact of experience that at certain periods I pursue a course of conduct *divergent* from that prompted by my will's spontaneous impulse. It is most clear, then, that at these particular periods, my will is not *infallibly* determined by the preponderating influences or attractions of the moment. In other words, the phenomena of those periods make it irrefragably certain that the doctrine of determinism is false."<sup>1</sup>

"This argument," says Mr. Mallock, "amounts to nothing. For," he continues, "Dr. Ward (1) instead of attempting to find any internal flaw" in the determinist arguments, "admits that so far as a large part of human life is concerned, they are correct, irrefragable and conclusive." (2) "In other words, Dr. Ward frankly admits that most of the actions of all of us are as completely determined and necessary as the most thorough-going determinist could maintain them to be." (3) "Instead of doing anything to reconcile" free-will with determinism, "he contents himself with admitting that the mysterious action of the former extends over a smaller domain of human conduct than most of the advocates of free-will suppose, and that the domain of the necessary or the determined is very considerably larger." (4) "Free-will," according to his own admission, "is essentially will without motive. Thus an event or process which in the larger part of human conduct, his analysis shows to be impossible and even unthinkable, is in the smaller part, not only not impossible, but of constant occurrence." Hence concludes Mr. Mallock, "the sole result at which Dr. Ward arrives is not even an apparent re-conciliation of free will with Determinism. He leaves free will, on one hand, as unthinkable and unintelligible as he finds it: he leaves Determinism on the other, with its foundation unshaken, untouched."

<sup>1</sup> "Philosophy of Theism," Vol. II, p. 16.

What is to be said of Mr. Mallock's criticism? Merely this, that the position ascribed to Dr. Ward in the four passages just quoted—passages which form the basis of Mr. Mallock's criticism—is fundamentally different from Dr. Ward's actual position as set forth in his published essays. (1) We read with amazement, "Dr. Ward did not attempt to find an internal flaw in the determinist arguments." Dr. Ward resolves the discussion into an appeal to facts of experience and then thoroughly establishes that such facts make "it irrefragably certain that Determinism is false." To give irrefragable proof that a doctrine is false is surely to find an internal flaw in it. (2) "Dr. Ward frankly admits that most of the actions of us all are as completely determined and necessary as the most thoroughgoing Determinist could maintain them to be." There is not so much as a single passage in Dr. Ward's works which, if taken with the context, would justify this assertion. On the contrary, Dr. Ward repeatedly states: "that man is free during pretty nearly the whole of his waking life." This statement is the thesis of an essay of over seventy-five pages.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, he thoroughly concurs with Father Gury in the assertion that, man, during his earthly course, *while sui compos, never acts under necessity*. (3) "Dr. Ward contents himself with admitting that the mysterious action of freewill extends over a smaller domain of human conduct than most of the advocates of free-will suppose." Dr. Ward admits nothing of the sort. "The tenet . . . that my will is only free at those particular moments, when, after expressly debating and consulting with myself as to the choice I shall make between two or more competing alternatives, I make my definite resolve accordingly; this tenet, held by most non-Catholic and many Catholic Libertarians—we cannot but regard as erring gravely against reason, against sound morality and against Catholic Theology." "We maintain that when (this tenet) is embodied in concrete fact and translated into everyday practice, the very doctrine of Determinism is less repulsive to the common sense and the common voice of mankind than is (this)—doctrine on the limits of Freewill." "I am my own master and responsible for my course of action during pretty near the whole of my waking

<sup>1</sup> "Philosophy of Theism," 18th Essay.



life." (4) Finally, Mr. Mallock tells us: "Freewill, according to Dr. Ward's admission, is essentially will without motive." Mr. Mallock here means that the anti-impulsive resolve is unmotivated. This is sheer nonsense. It is only in relation to the anti-impulsive resolve that Dr. Ward would have us speak of "motives" at all. The influence of the spontaneous impulse is an "attraction." "But a 'motive' is a thought of such and such an end which the will, by its own active resolve, chooses to pursue." "What are the motives," asks Dr. Ward, "which induce a man to resist his spontaneous impulse?" And he answers: "There are two which are adequate to the purpose. First there is my resolve of doing what is right: and secondly, my desire of promoting my permanent happiness in the next world, or even in this." So much for Mr. Mallock's statements individually. Taken collectively they are contradicted by the "common axiom of theologians," which is also fundamental with Dr. Ward, viz: "that no object necessitates the human will, except only God, as seen face to face in heaven."

Mr. Mallock's criticism of the position of "one of the clearest and most logical English dialecticians," based as it is on an utter misrepresentation of that philosopher's position, amounts to nothing more or less than a disgraceful caricature.

We have reached the end of Mr. Mallock's destructive (!) criticism of our Catholic apologists. We have seen that science in the sense of "rigorously verified fact" repudiates Evolutionary Monism at every step, and is throughout in harmony with the doctrine of Theism. To the objections already urged against Monistic philosophy it is needless to add the contradiction in which, as Mr. Mallock himself points out, it is involved by its postulate of a continuous ether. Professor Haeckel's theory, therefore, of the "eternal cosmogenetic process" is from every point of view thoroughly unscientific, and we may dismiss its claim to be even a consistent system of philosophy with the words of von Hartmann; "Haeckel is, therefore, an ontological pluralist, since he conceives nature as a plurality of separate substances (atoms): a metaphysical dualist, since he assumes two metaphysical principles (force and matter) in every single substance: a phenomenal dualist, since he recog-

<sup>1</sup> "Philosophy of Theism," Vol. II, p. 317.



nizes two different fields of phenomena (external mechanical occurrence and internal sensation and will): a hylozoist, since he ascribes life and soul to every part of matter: a philosopher of identity, since he regards one and the same kind of substances as the ground of both fields of phenomena: a cosmic monist, since he denies the teleological uniformity in nature and admits only causal law; and a mechanist, since he regards all causal processes as mechanical processes of material particles."<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Mallock's latest excursion into the field of philosophy must come as a surprise and a disappointment to those who are familiar with the thoughtful and critical tone of most of his other writings. It is hard to understand how a man of Mr. Mallock's intellectual acumen could regard the dogmatic pronouncements of Professor Haeckel as the highest achievements of science. Among the scholars of the day Professor Haeckel stands discredited as a man of science. Professor Paulsen has recently stigmatized as a disgrace to German scholarship, the very work of Haeckel's from which Mr. Mallock has drawn so extensively and so unquestioningly. And still more recently, Professor Rüttemeyer, the distinguished zoölogist, has openly accused Mr. Mallock's "eminent and thoughtful man of science" of "playing with the public and the natural sciences." That Mr. Mallock should regard Professor Haeckel's theorizing seriously, is to be wondered at; that he should confound such reckless speculation with science is still more amazing.

But if his rash espousal of Professor Haeckel's views is unworthy of Mr. Mallock's prestige as an intellectual accountant, his unfair treatment of theistic apologists is no less deserving of censure. In spite of his repeated assurance that all their arguments amount to nothing a cursory perusal of their works shows that Mr. Mallock has in every case failed to understand the position he attacks. This misconception not only invalidates his criticism of Father Gerard and Father Maher, but in the case of Dr. Ward, exposes Mr. Mallock to the further charge of culpable negligence.

EDWIN V. O'HARA.

ACADEMY OF APOLOGETICS,  
ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

<sup>1</sup>"Geschichte der Metaphysik," Vol. II, p. 456.

## VATICAN SYRIAC MSS.: OLD AND NEW PRESS-MARKS.<sup>1</sup>

When Joseph Simon Assemani began his great work, the Bibliotheca Orientalis, the Syriac MSS. of the Vatican Library formed nine separate collections.

1. The old Vatican Collection, which had been catalogued by Abraham Echellensis. It included MSS. in the Syriac language only;<sup>2</sup> the Karšūnī MSS., that is, those written in Arabic with Syriac characters, had been added to the Arabic Collection.<sup>3</sup> This old Vatican Collection contained 49 MSS.

2. The Nitrian Collection, brought from the Syrian monastery of St. Mary in the desert of Nitria in Egypt. This collection had been purchased in 1707 for Pope Clement XI by Elias Assemani, a cousin of J. S. Assemani. It included 34 MSS., one of which (no. XX) in Karšūnī.

3. The Echellensis Collection which had been bought by Pope Clement XI. It was made up of the private collection of Abraham Echellensis and of that of his successor, Faustus Naironi. It contained 64 MSS., 20 of which were in Syriac.

4. The Amida Collection, so called because it came from the private library of the Chaldean patriarch Joseph I, a native of Amida (Diarbekir), who died at Rome in 1713. 18 of its 20 MSS. were in Syriac.

5. The Beroe Collection, gathered by Gabriel Eva, a Maronite monk of the Order of St. Anthony, during his sojourn (1718-21) at Aleppo (the ancient Beroe) whither he had been sent by Clement XI to settle certain disputes among the Maronites of that region. This collection numbered only 13 MSS., among which were 9 Syriac MSS.

6. The Assemani Collection, acquired by J. S. Assemani himself, during a voyage to the East (1715-17) undertaken at

<sup>1</sup> Digest of an article written by Dr. Hyvernât in the *Annales de Saint Louis des Français* for October, 1902, under the title "Concordances des côtes des anciens fonds et du fonds actuel syriaques de la Vaticane."

<sup>2</sup> Some of these MSS. had been bought by the authorities of the Vatican Library; the others had been composed and written by the "Scriptores" themselves.

<sup>3</sup> When the Assemanis undertook a new classification of the Vatican MSS., the Karšūnī MSS., fifteen in number, were transferred to the Syriac Collection.

the request of Clement XI. It contained 45 Syriac MSS. Some of these were brought from the Monastery of St. Mary in Nitria, 12 from the Convent of Saidnaia near Damascus, and the majority of them from Aleppo and Mount Lebanon.<sup>1</sup>

7. The Scandar Collection brought from the East for Pope Innocent XIII, by the Maronite Andrew Scandar, professor of Arabic at the Roman Sapienza. It numbered 61 MSS., distributed as follows: 35 Syriac (I-XXXV), 19 Arabic (XXXVI-LIV), 6 Greek (LV-LX), and one Hebrew (LXI).

8. The Carafa Collection, formed with the help of Eastern missionaries by Peter Aloysius Carafa, Archbishop of Larissa and Secretary to the Propaganda. He gave it to Clement XI for the Vatican Library. This collection which was added to that of Andrew Scandar contained 5 Syriac MSS. (LXII-LXVI), 6 Arabic MSS. (LXVII-LXXII), and 4 Greek MSS. (LXXIII-LXXVI).

9. The Propaganda Collection, acquired by the authorities of the Congregation P. F. and transferred by them to the Vatican Library in 1723 together with other Oriental Collections. This Collection numbered 16 Syriac MSS.

Abraham Echellensis wrote a brief catalogue of the Old Vatican Collection under the title "*Index librorum (manuscriptorum) Chaldaicorum et Syriacorum, Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ, 12 junii 1660.*" He also catalogued the Arabic MSS. He died in 1664. His work was continued by John Matthew Naironi, who added the other Oriental MSS. to the Arabic Collection and placed at the head of the Syriac MSS. the only Samaritan MS. then at the Vatican. Naironi's Catalogue,<sup>2</sup> still unpublished, is to be found, together with the "Index" of Echellensis, in the reading room of the Vatican Library. The Index con-

<sup>1</sup> During this same voyage J. S. Assemani collected a certain number of Coptic and Arabic MSS. Among the latter were 11 Karšūnī MSS., which, like those of the old Arabic Collection, were classed with the Syriac MSS. For a description of these Karšūnī MSS., see "*Index Codicum*" of the "*Bibliotheca Orientalis*," I, p. 619.

<sup>2</sup> Its complete title is: *Catalogus Codicum MSS. linguarum Orientalium Vaticanæ Bibliothecæ nempe Samaritanæ, Chaldaicæ, etc.* S. D. N. Innocentio XI P. M. Em. et Rev. Laurentio Brancato de Lauræa S. R. E. Card. Biblioth. Illustriss. D. Emanuele a Schelstrate ejusdem Bibliothecæ Custode. Inceptus ab Abrahamo Echellense A. D. MDCLX et absolutus a Io. Matthæo Nairono Banesio Maronitis in eadem Bibliotheca Scriptoribus A. D. MDCLXXXVI.

tains only 47 numbers; the Catalogue 48. To these a 49th number was added later.

The remaining eight collections were catalogued and described briefly by J. S. Assemani in his "*Bibliotheca Orientalis*."<sup>1</sup> Later Stephen Evodius Assemani, in collaboration with Joseph Simon Assemani, his uncle, undertook a systematic and detailed catalogue of all the Oriental MSS. in the Vatican Library.<sup>2</sup> The separate collections in each language were merged into one, and the MSS. were classified according to their contents, no account being made of the particular collection to which they belonged originally. Thus the nine Syriac Collections, of which we spoke above, were thrown together into one, and their MSS. were designated by new numbers. Such a procedure would have caused no great inconvenience, had the authors of the Catalogue given a concordance of the numbers of the MSS. in the old collections with the numbers in the new collection they had formed. But, instead of this, they simply noted, at the beginning of the description of each MS., the number which the MS. bore originally. Thus we can refer from the Catalogue to the "*Index Codicum*" of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, but not vice versa; in other words, the Catalogue is of no practical use to the readers of the *Bibliotheca*. Besides, the Catalogue of the Assemanis is exceedingly rare. Hardly was the edition finished when it was almost entirely destroyed by fire. Only a few copies remain, so that, to-day, the "*Index Codicum*" of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* is practically the only source of information regarding the contents of the Syriac MSS. of the Vatican. Unfortunately, the numbers of the MSS.

<sup>1</sup> *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana in qua manuscripti Codices syriaci, arabici . . . Romae, 1721-1728, fol., 3 tomes in 4 vols.*

See tome I. "*Index Codicum Manucriptorum quos Clemens XI Pont. Max Bibliothecae Vaticanae addidit.*" Nitrian Coll., p. 561; Echellensis Coll., p. 573; Amida Coll., p. 581; Beroe Coll., p. 585; and Assemani Coll., p. 606; tome II. "*Index Codicum*" . . . as above, "una cum iis quos Sanctissimus Pater Innocentius XIII in eandem Bibliothecam inferre iussit," Scandar Coll., p. 486, Carafa Coll., p. 517; tome III. "*Codices Manuscripti Syriaci, Coptici, Arabici et Armenici typis impressi ad sacram Congregationem de Propaganda Fide ex Oriente transmissi ejusdemque decreto in Bibliothecam Vaticanam illati, etc.*" Propaganda Coll., p. 635.

<sup>2</sup> *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codicum manucriptorum Catalogus in tres partes distributus, etc., Primae Partis, tomus I (Hebrew MSS.), tomus II et III (Syriac MSS.) Romae, 1757-1759.*

in this "Index" do not correspond with their numbers in the new classification, the only one now in use.

We have thought that it would be a welcome help to the ever increasing number of Syriac students to publish the two following Concordances: the first, of the old numbers with the new; the second, of the new numbers with the old. By means of the first, the reader of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* will know the number which the MS. he desires to consult bears in the new classification; by means of the second, those who cannot consult the Catalogue of the two Assemanis will be able to use the "Index Codicum" in its stead.

Let us add a few words of explanation for the right understanding and use of these two Concordances. In the first Concordance, after the old Vatican and Assemani Collections, the numbers of the Karšūnī MSS., of which we spoke above, are given under the heading "Supplement." A No. XIIbis has been added to the Propaganda Collection, and a No. XLVI to the Collection of Assemani. Although these two MSS. are noticed neither in the *Codices Manuscripti* of the third tome, nor in the "Index Codicum" of the first tome, of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, they are, nevertheless, so numbered in the Catalogue. It must be remarked that Nos. XLI, XLIII, and XLV of the old Vatican Collection, No. XII of the Berce Collection, and Nos. XIII and XIV of the Amida Collection, have no corresponding numbers in the second Concordance. As there is no trace of these MSS. in the catalogue, their disappearance must go back to an early date. It is also to be noted that in the second Concordance MSS. IX, X, XI of the Propaganda Collection are registered under a single MS. in three volumes. The total number of the MSS. of the old Syriac Collections is thus reduced from 231 to 225. By adding to them the 26 MSS. taken from the old Arabic Collections, we get the sum total of 251 MSS. Yet the second Concordance has 256 numbers. This is owing to the fact that the authors of the Catalogue added 4 MSS. (181, 189, 191, 195) which had found their way into the Vatican Library after the formation of the early collections, and a fifth MS. (230), the origin of which is not given. These five MSS. are designated by "Add." The letter "A" has been written after the numbers of the Karšūnī MSS. taken from the

old Arabic Collections. The sigla "Vat." or "Vatic." followed by Roman numerals, refer to the MSS. of the old Vatican Collection; these same sigla, followed by Arabic numerals, designate the MSS. in the new classification. The two Concordances cover only the Vatican MSS. mentioned in the Bibliotheca Orientalis and in the Catalogue of Assemani. Since then the number of Syriac MSS. of the Vatican Library has been almost doubled by the addition of Assemani's own Collection and that of the Borgian Museum.

## I.

## CONCORDANCE OF THE OLD NUMBERS WITH THE NEW.

## 1° Old Vatican Collection.

VATIC. I	=	VAT. 7	VATIC. XXVI	=	VAT. 88
" II	=	" 2	" XXVII	=	" 89
" III	=	" 3	" XXVIII	=	" 188
" IV	=	" 5	" XXIX	=	" 28
" V	=	" 4	" XXX	=	" 36
" VI	=	" 10	" XXXI	=	" 148
" VII	=	" 9	" XXXII	=	" 186
" VIII	=	" 15	" XXXIII	=	" 193
" IX	=	" 17	" XXXIV	=	" 18
" X	=	" 16	" XXXV	=	" 95
" XI	=	" 19	" XXXVI	=	" 35
" XII	=	" 22	" XXXVII	=	" 158
" XIII	=	" 154	" XXXVIII	=	" 6
" XIV	=	" 128	" XXXIX	=	" 107
" XV	=	" 27	" XL	=	" 145
" XVI	=	" 65	" XLI	=	"
" XVII	=	" 66	" XLII	=	" 226
" XVIII	=	" 45	" XLIII	=	"
" XIX	=	" 46	" XLIV	=	" 190
" XX	=	" 86	" XLV	=	"
" XXI	=	" 68	" XLVI	=	" 57
" XXII	=	" 69	" XLVII	=	" 108
" XXIII	=	" 67	" XLVIII	=	" 85
" XXIV	=	" 87	" XLIX	=	" 228
" XXV	=	" 62			



*Supplement.*

VATIC. III (A)	= VAt. 98	VATIC. CXIV (A)	= VAt. 205
" X (A)	= " 197	" CXXXIII(A)=	" 212
" XVII (A)	= " 203	" CXLI (A)	= " 213
" XLI (A)	= " 211	" CL (A)	= " 99
" XLIX (A)	= " 229	" CLI (A)	= " 214
" LII (A)	= " 225	" CLXVIII(A)=	" 208
" LV (A)	= " 199	" CLXXXII(A)=	" 227
" LIX (A)	= " 72		

*2° Nitrian Collection.*

NITR. I	= VAt. 12	NITR. XVIII	= VAt. 122
" II	= " 13	" XIX	= " 123
" III	= " 25	" XX	= " 198
" IV	= " 26	" XXI	= " 124
" V	= " 117	" XXII	= " 125
" VI	= " 110	" XXIII	= " 254
" VII	= " 111	" XXIV	= " 106
" VIII	= " 112	" XXV	= " 137
" IX	= " 113	" XXVI	= " 138
" X	= " 251	" XXVII	= " 136
" XI	= " 116	" XXVIII	= " 139
" XII	= " 114	" XXIX	= " 140
" XIII	= " 115	" XXX	= " 255
" XIV	= " 252	" XXXI	= " 141
" XV	= " 253	" XXXII	= " 142
" XVI	= " 92	" XXXIII	= " 143
" XVII	= " 93	" XXXIV	= " 256

*3° Echellensis Collection.*

ECH. I	= VAt. 8	ECH. XVII	= VAt. 176
" II	= " 47	" XVIII	= " 249
" III	= " 48	" XIX	= " 231
" IV	= " 51	" XX	= " 210
" V	= " 29	" XXI	= " 250
" VI	= " 70	" XXVII	= " 194
" XI	= " 169	" XXXVI	= " 102
" XII	= " 172	" LIX	= " 209
" XIV	= " 146	" LX	= " 232
" XVI	= " 100	" LXIV	= " 101

4° *Amida Collection.*

AMID. I	= V <sub>AT.</sub> 83	AMID. X	= V <sub>AT.</sub> 42
" II	= " 84	" XI	= " 43
" III	= " 61	" XII	= " 44
" IV	= " 224	" XIII	= "
" V	= " 24	" XIV	= "
" VI	= " 23	" XV	= " 223
" VII	= " 184	" XVII	= " 206
" VIII	= " 90	" XVIII	= " 221
" IX	= " 63	" XIX	= " 201

5° *Beroe Collection.*

BERGEENS. I	= V <sub>AT.</sub> 159	BERGEENS. VIII	= V <sub>AT.</sub> 121
" III	= " 243	" IX	= " 170
" IV	= " 130	" XII	= "
" V	= " 131	" XIII	= " 220
" VI	= " 202		

6° *Assemani Collection.*

ASS. I	= V <sub>AT.</sub> 160	ASS. XXIV	= V <sub>AT.</sub> 242
" II	= " 161	" XXV	= " 233
" III	= " 103	" XXVI	= " 234
" IV	= " 119	" XXVII	= " 235
" V	= " 120	" XXVIII	= " 236
" VI	= " 126	" XXIX	= " 237
" VII	= " 118	" XXX	= " 238
" VIII	= " 104	" XXXI	= " 239
" IX	= " 105	" XXXII	= " 240
" X	= " 109	" XXXIII	= " 241
" XI	= " 135	" XXXIV	= " 59
" XII	= " 163	" XXXV	= " 74
" XIII	= " 162	" XXXVI	= " 77
" XIV	= " 144	" XXXVII	= " 40
" XV	= " 94	" XXXVIII	= " 76
" XVI	= " 155	" XXXIX	= " 53
" XVII	= " 1	" XL	= " 41
" XVIII	= " 14	" XLI	= " 21
" XIX	= " 31	" XLII	= " 80
" XX	= " 30	" XLIII	= " 81
" XXI	= " 39	" XLIV	= " 82
" XXII	= " 52	" XLV	= " 174
" XXIII	= " 50	" XLVI	= " 156

*Supplement.*

Ass. LXXXV (A)	= VAt. 216	Ass. LXXXI (A)	= VAt. 217
" LXXXVI (A)	= " 133	" LXXXII (A)	= " 215
" LXXXVII (A)	= " 196	" LXXXIII (A)	= " 218
" LXXXVIII (A)	= " 134	" LXXXIV (A)	= " 219
" LXXXIX (A)	= " 200	" XCVI (A)	= " 245
" LXXX (A)	= " 207		

*7° Scandar Collection.*

Scand. I	= VAt. 91	Scand. XIX	= VAt. 244
" II	= " 64	" XX	= " 183
" III	= " 150	" XXI	= " 182
" IV	= " 187	" XXII	= " 152
" V	= " 204	" XXIII	= " 132
" VI	= " 175	" XXIV	= " 166
" VII	= " 180	" XXV	= " 171
" VIII	= " 222	" XXVI	= " 168
" IX	= " 177	" XXVII	= " 173
" X	= " 178	" XXVIII	= " 96
" XI	= " 149	" XXIX	= " 58
" XII	= " 185	" XXX	= " 97
" XIII	= " 165	" XXXI	= " 147
" XIV	= " 129	" XXXII	= " 37
" XV	= " 179	" XXXIII	= " 78
" XVI	= " 157	" XXXIV	= " 11
" XVII	= " 164	" XXXV	= " 192
" XVIII	= " 127		

*8° Carafa Collection.*

Car. LXII	= VAt. 49	Car. LXV	= VAt. 75
" LXIII	= " 54	" LXVI	= " 79
" LXIV	= " 20		

*9° Propaganda Collection.*

Prop. I	= VAt. 247	Prop. X	= VAt. 55 t.2
" II	= " 56	" XI	= " 55 t.3
" III	= " 71	" XII	= " 38
" IV	= " 60	" XII <sup>bis</sup>	= " 73
" V	= " 248	" XIII	= " 246
" VI	= " 32	" XIV	= " 167
" VII	= " 33	" XV	= " 153
" VIII	= " 34	" XVI	= " 151
" IX	= " 55 t.1		

## II.

## CONCORDANCE OF THE NEW NUMBERS WITH THE OLD.

VAT.	1 = ASS. XVII.	VAT.	42 = AMID. X.
"	2 = VAT. II.	"	43 = AMID. XI.
"	3 = VAT. III.	"	44 = AMID. XII.
"	4 = VAT. V.	"	45 = VAT. XVIII.
"	5 = VAT. IV.	"	46 = VAT. XIX.
"	6 = VAT. XXXVIII.	"	47 = ECHELL. II.
"	7 = VAT. I.	"	48 = ECHELL. III.
"	8 = ECHELL. I.	"	49 = CAR. LXII.
"	9 = VAT. VII.	"	50 = ASSEM. XXIII.
"	10 = VAT. VI.	"	51 = ECHELL. IV.
"	11 = SCAND. XXXIV.	"	52 = ASSEM. XXII.
"	12 = NITR. I.	"	53 = ASSEM. XXXIX.
"	13 = NITR. II.	"	54 = CAR. LXIII.
"	14 = ASS. XVIII.	"	55 = PROP. IX-XI.
"	15 = VAT. VIII.	"	56 = PROP. II.
"	16 = VAT. X.	"	57 = VAT. XLVI.
"	17 = VAT. IX.	"	58 = SCAND. XXIX.
"	18 = VAT. XXXIV.	"	59 = ASSEM. XXXIV.
"	19 = VAT. XI.	"	60 = PROP. IV.
"	20 = CAR. LXIV.	"	61 = AMID. III.
"	21 = ASSEM. XLI.	"	62 = VAT. XXV.
"	22 = VAT. XII.	"	63 = AMID. IX.
"	23 = AMID. VI.	"	64 = SCAND. II.
"	24 = AMID. V.	"	65 = VAT. XVI.
"	25 = NITR. III.	"	66 = VAT. XVII.
"	26 = NITR. IV.	"	67 = VAT. XXIII.
"	27 = VAT. XV.	"	68 = VAT. XXI.
"	28 = VAT. XXIX.	"	69 = VAT. XXII.
"	29 = ECHELL. V.	"	70 = ECHELL. VI.
"	30 = ASSEM. XX.	"	71 = PROP. III.
"	31 = ASSEM. XIX.	"	72 = VAT. LIX (A).
"	32 = PROP. VI.	"	73 = PROP. XII <i>bis</i> .
"	33 = PROP. VII.	"	74 = ASSEM. XXXV.
"	34 = PROP. VIII.	"	75 = CAR. LXV.
"	35 = VAT. XXXVI.	"	76 = ASSEM. XXXVIII.
"	36 = VAT. XXX.	"	77 = ASSEM. XXXVI.
"	37 = SCAND. XXXII.	"	78 = SCAND. XXXIII.
"	38 = PROP. XII.	"	79 = CAR. LXVI.
"	39 = ASSEM. XXI.	"	80 = ASSEM. XLII.
"	40 = ASSEM. XXXVII.	"	81 = ASSEM. XLIII.
"	41 = ASSEM. XL.	"	82 = ASSEM. XLIV.

- |                         |                            |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| VAT. 83 = AMID. I.      | VAT. 126 = ASSEM. VI.      |
| " 84 = AMID. II.        | " 127 = SCAND. XVIII.      |
| " 85 = VAT. XLVIII.     | " 128 = VAT. XIV.          |
| " 86 = VAT. XX.         | " 129 = SCAND. XIV.        |
| " 87 = VAT. XXIV.       | " 130 = BERCEENS. IV.      |
| " 88 = VAT. XXVI.       | " 131 = BERCEENS. V.       |
| " 89 = VAT. XXVII.      | " 132 = SCAND. XXIII.      |
| " 90 = AMID. VIII.      | " 133 = ASS. LXXXVI (A).   |
| " 91 = SCAND. I.        | " 134 = ASS. LXXXVIII (A). |
| " 92 = NITR. XVI.       | " 135 = ASSEM. XI.         |
| " 93 = NITR. XVII.      | " 136 = NITR. XXVII.       |
| " 94 = ASSEM. XV.       | " 137 = NITR. XXV.         |
| " 95 = VAT. XXXV.       | " 138 = NITR. XXVI.        |
| " 96 = SCAND. XXVIII.   | " 139 = NITR. XXVIII.      |
| " 97 = SCAND. XXX.      | " 140 = NITR. XXIX.        |
| " 98 = VAT. III (A).    | " 141 = NITR. XXXI.        |
| " 99 = VAT. CL (A).     | " 142 = NITR. XXXII.       |
| " 100 = ECHELL. XVI.    | " 143 = NITR. XXXIII.      |
| " 101 = ECHELL. LXIV.   | " 144 = ASSEM. XIV.        |
| " 102 = ECHELL. XXXVI.  | " 145 = VAT. XL.           |
| " 103 = ASSEM. III.     | " 146 = ECHELL. XIV.       |
| " 104 = ASSEM. VIII.    | " 147 = SCAND. XXXI.       |
| " 105 = ASSEM. IX.      | " 148 = VAT. XXXI.         |
| " 106 = NITR. XXIV.     | " 149 = SCAND. XI.         |
| " 107 = VAT. XXXIX.     | " 150 = SCAND. III.        |
| " 108 = VAT. XLVII.     | " 151 = PROP. XVI.         |
| " 109 = ASSEM. X.       | " 152 = SCAND. XXII.       |
| " 110 = NITR. VI.       | " 153 = PROP. XV.          |
| " 111 = NITR. VII.      | " 154 = VAT. XIII.         |
| " 112 = NITR. VIII.     | " 155 = ASSEM. XVI.        |
| " 113 = NITR. IX.       | " 156 = ASSEM. XLVI.       |
| " 114 = NITR. XII.      | " 157 = SCAND. XVI.        |
| " 115 = NITR. XIII.     | " 158 = VAT. XXXVII.       |
| " 116 = NITR. XI.       | " 159 = BERCEENS. I.       |
| " 117 = NITR. V.        | " 160 = ASSEM. I.          |
| " 118 = ASSEM. VII.     | " 161 = ASSEM. II.         |
| " 119 = ASSEM. IV.      | " 162 = ASSEM. XIII.       |
| " 120 = ASSEM. V.       | " 163 = ASSEM. XII.        |
| " 121 = BERCEENS. VIII. | " 164 = SCAND. XVII.       |
| " 122 = NITR. XVIII.    | " 165 = SCAND. XIII.       |
| " 123 = NITR. XIX.      | " 166 = SCAND. XXIV.       |
| " 124 = NITR. XXI.      | " 167 = PROP. XIV.         |
| " 125 = NITR. XXII.     | " 168 = SCAND. XXVI.       |

VAT. 169 = ECHELL. XI.  
 " 170 = BERGEEN. IX.  
 " 171 = SCAND. XXV.  
 " 172 = ECHELL. XII.  
 " 173 = SCAND. XXVII.  
 " 174 = ASSEM. XLV.  
 " 175 = SCAND. VI.  
 " 176 = ECHELL. XVII.  
 " 177 = SCAND. IX.  
 " 178 = SCAND. X.  
 " 179 = SCAND. XV.  
 " 180 = SCAND. VII.  
 " 181 = ADD. I.  
 " 182 = SCAND. XXI.  
 " 183 = SCAND. XX.  
 " 184 = AMID. VII.  
 " 185 = SCAND. XII.  
 " 186 = VAT. XXXII.  
 " 187 = SCAND. IV.  
 " 188 = VAT. XXVIII.  
 " 189 = ADD. II.  
 " 190 = VAT. XLIV.  
 " 191 = ADD. III.  
 " 192 = SCAND. XXXV.  
 " 193 = VAT. XXXIII.  
 " 194 = ECHELL. XXVII.  
 " 195 = ADD. IV.  
 " 196 = ASSEM. LXXVII(A).  
 " 197 = VAT. X (A).  
 " 198 = NITR. XX.  
 " 199 = VAT. LV (A).  
 " 200 = ASS. LXXIX (A).  
 " 201 = AMID. XIX.  
 " 202 = BERGEENS. VI.  
 " 203 = VAT. XVII (A).  
 " 204 = SCAND. V.  
 " 205 = VAT. CXIV (A).  
 " 206 = AMID. XVII.  
 " 207 = ASS. LXXX (A).  
 " 208 = VAT. CLXVIII (A).  
 " 209 = ECHELL. LIX.  
 " 210 = ECHELL. XX.  
 " 211 = VAT. XLI (A).  
 " 212 = VAT. CXXIII (A).

VAT. 213 = VAT. CXLI (A).  
 " 214 = VAT. CLI (A).  
 " 215 = ASS. LXXXII (A).  
 " 216 = ASS. LXXXV (A).  
 " 217 = ASS. LXXXI (A).  
 " 218 = ASS. LXXXIII (A).  
 " 219 = ASS. LXXXIV (A).  
 " 220 = BERGEENS. XIII.  
 " 221 = AMID. XVIII.  
 " 222 = SCAND. VIII.  
 " 223 = AMID. XV.  
 " 224 = AMID. IV.  
 " 225 = VAT. LII (A).  
 " 226 = VAT. XLII.  
 " 227 = VAT. CLXXXIII(A).  
 " 228 = VAT. XLIX.  
 " 229 = VAT. XLIX (A).  
 " 230 = ADD. V.  
 " 231 = ECHELL. XIX.  
 " 232 = ECHELL. LX.  
 " 233 = ASSEM. XXV.  
 " 234 = ASSEM. XXVI.  
 " 235 = ASSEM. XXVII.  
 " 236 = ASSEM. XXVIII.  
 " 237 = ASSEM. XXIX.  
 " 238 = ASSEM. XXX.  
 " 239 = ASSEM. XXXI.  
 " 240 = ASSEM. XXXII.  
 " 241 = ASSEM. XXXIII.  
 " 242 = ASSEM. XXIV.  
 " 243 = BERGEENS. III.  
 " 244 = SCAND. XIX.  
 " 245 = ASSEM. XCVI (A).  
 " 246 = PROP. XIII.  
 " 247 = PROP. I.  
 " 248 = PROP. V.  
 " 249 = ECHELL. XVIII.  
 " 250 = ECHELL. XXI.  
 " 251 = NITR. X.  
 " 252 = NITR. XIV.  
 " 253 = NITR. XV.  
 " 254 = NITR. XXIII.  
 " 255 = NITR. XXX.  
 " 256 = NITR. XXXIV.

HENRI HYVERNAT.

Peti

R

1

T

eral

pers

men

of t

spec

acqu

grow

when

orde

doct

(Lei

plete

R

the

actu

may

cial

inve

But

only

its l

R

vidu

But

this

tion

1897

Arch

teen

IV;

thirt

Brev

oblig

Libri

torun

(13)



## BOOK REVIEWS.

### **Petite Introduction aux Inventaires des Archives du Vatican.**

Par le R. P. Louis Guérard, prêtre de l'Oratoire, Paris: Picard, 1901. 8°, pp. 39.

The opening of the Vatican Archives by Leo XIII to the general public of scholars has naturally brought to Rome not a few persons anxious to profit by this vast repertorium of historical documents. It is not every one who is properly equipped for the use of the written authorities; as a preliminary, both a general and a special palæographical training is necessary. This may be now acquired, either in one of the university schools of history that have grown up in Europe, or at Rome within the limits of the Vatican, where a two years' course of three lessons a week is now in working order. A good French manual, that of M. Giry, contains excellent doctrine, and the classic German "Handbuch der Diplomatik" (Leipzig, 1889) of H. Bresslau is simply indispensable for any complete training.

But how shall the would-be editor of original materials out of the Vatican Archives go to work in order to know where they actually are? If he knows precisely what document he wants, it may not be very difficult to lay his hand upon it—the obliging officials will probably find it for him through means of certain ancient inventories of the Archives, or through their own trained instinct. But the special student of some line or problem of history knows, only too often, no more than the general nature of his subject, and its limits in time and place.

If the Vatican Archives had ever been fully inventoried, individual research would still be toilsome, by reason of their vastness. But no such work has yet been done, perhaps ever can be done for this *mare magnum* of mediæval and later history. With the exception of the workers on the "Repertorium Germanicum" (Berlin, 1897) no systematic dépouillement of the several depositories of the Archives has been attempted for the centuries this side of the thirteenth, and that valuable work only reaches the pontificate of Eugene IV; nor does it pretend to be exhaustive.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the study of German history the authors of the R. G. have examined thirteen depositories of the Archives: (1) *Registra Vaticana*, (2) *Registra Brevium*, (3) *Registra Supplicationum*, (4) *Registra Lateranensia*, (5) *Libri obligationum prælatorum*, (6) *Libri annatorum*, (7) *Libri Solutionum*, (8) *Libri quitantiarum*, (9) *Introitus et Exitus*, (10) *Libri bulletarum et mandatorum*, (11) *Diversa cameraria*, (12) *Acta of the Sacred College (of Cardinals)*, (13) Various other documents scattered in isolated volumes.

The Abbé Guérard, priest of the French Oratory, and one of the national chaplains of St. Louis des Français at Rome, undertook in the *Annales* of that society (January, 1897) to prepare a guide for the use of the existing inventories of the Vatican Archives, with the particular purpose of aiding the students of the mediæval history of provincial France. This study, somewhat enlarged, appeared in the same periodical (July, 1900), and is now presented to the general public. Its few pages are the result of no little toil, and the author acknowledges that without the habitual kindness of the sub-archivist of the Vatican even these notes could not have been put together.

The nearest approach to a general inventory is owing to Petrus Doninus de Pretis, prefect of the Archives in 1727.<sup>2</sup> It is a very summary enumeration of the contents of the greater part of the volumes that contain the official acts of the Cancellaria Apostolica. It represents, therefore, the most important part of the Vatican Archives. For the thirteenth century there exists an inventory of the names of persons and places mentioned in the subscriptions of the bulls. From John XXII to the end of the Great Schism there is a double series of "Registers" of bulls—the "Regesta Avenionensia," and the "Regesta Vaticana." The former were removed to the Vatican towards the end of the eighteenth century. Two inventories of them exist, made at Avignon in the eighteenth century—one of them is in 85 folio volumes. The "Regesta Vaticana" for the fourteenth century are an official transcription of the preceding. The division of "Epistolæ Secretæ" that contains the political correspondence of the popes in that period, gave way in the fifteenth century to the series of briefs (Epistolæ Breves) that have been indexed from Clement VII to Leo XI (1523-1605). A very important series in several thousand volumes is that of the "Regesta Lateranensia" (Dataria) that reaches from Boniface IX to Leo XIII. It does not seem to have been the object of any known inventory, though those who know it best say that its volumes present for the end of the fourteenth century a more complete portrait of papal administration than the "Regesta Vaticana" themselves. In addition, there are the 7,011 volumes of "Supplicationes" or requests and petitions, lately transferred to the Vatican, likewise insufficiently inventoried, though a fair idea of their contents for the

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Baumgarten, "Untersuchungen und Urkunden ueber die Camera Collegii Cardinalium fuer die Zeit von 1295-1437," Leipzig, 1898, also A. Cauchie, "De la création d'une Ecole Belge à Rome," Tournai, 1896. In this latter brochure, Dr. Cauchie has collected all the earlier literature relative to the great divisions of the Archives. M. Guérard declares this study "un aperçu d'ensemble fort utile" for the use of the Archives.

four  
mak  
cate  
as t  
dex  
de tr  
7  
very  
valu  
appe  
part  
ment  
torie  
centu  
thoug  
Mgr.  
as fa  
A  
larly  
ment  
work  
back  
to 18  
Ugoli  
are re  
Bolog  
is said  
recor  
An  
is tha  
part c  
1 "  
Paris,  
2 S  
Ranuzz  
Guérar  
3 "  
Moyen  
4 C  
divided  
lectaria  
the wor  
among

fourteenth and fifteenth centuries may be gained from the epoch-making work of Denifle.<sup>1</sup>

For these huge collections of original materials, M. Guérard indicates with all possible precision, and after such personal examination as the circumstances permit, the actual state of the inventories, indexes, summaries of contents, etc., as they are kept in the "cabinet de travail" of Mgr. Wenzel present sub-archivist.<sup>2</sup>

The records of the financial administration of the papacy are very abundant since the fourteenth century, inclusive. Several valuable studies, like those of Gottlob, Kirsch and others, have lately appeared, based on these materials. These financial records form part of the documents of the Camera Apostolica (Treasury Department of the Holy See), all whose existing records have been inventoried up to the fifteenth century by M. de Loye.<sup>3</sup> For the last four centuries no detailed inventory is at hand, as far as is known, although the volumes of each pontificate are recorded in De Pretis. Mgr. Baumgarten has published a conspectus of the "Obligaciones" as far as Julius II.<sup>4</sup>

A large portion of the records of the Camera Apostolica, particularly for modern times, is now incorporated with the Italian governmental archives; two manuscript inventories enable the student to work with some satisfaction. The earliest of these documents go back to the end of the fourteenth century, and the latest come down to 1860. Before 1870 this collection was preserved in the Palazzo Ugolini, near the Sapienza. In it, among other valuable deposits, are records of six provincial sub-treasuries of the Holy See—Avignon, Bologna, Campagna, Marittima, Fermo, Marca, the Patrimonio. It is said that in all there are some five hundred volumes of the financial records of the Holy See in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Another extensive collection of the documents of the Holy See is that once kept in the old papal citadel of Castel Sant-Angelo, now part of the Vatican Archives. It is provided with a chronological

<sup>1</sup> "La Désolation des Eglises de France pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans." Paris, Picard, 1899, 3 vols.

<sup>2</sup> Sans la complaisance et la patience de Mgr. Wenzel et de son neveu, M. Ranuzzi, il serait à peu près impossible à un débutant d'utiliser les répertoires, Guérard, op. cit., p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> "Archives de la Chambre apostolique," Paris. Fontemoing, 1899. Cf. *Moyen Age*, 1899, pp. 414 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. introd. to *Rep. Germ.* The records of the Camera Apostolica are divided into three classes: Introitus et Exitus; Servitia (Obligaciones); Collectariae, Inventaria et Processus. The vicissitudes of these records, related in the work just cited, have somewhat enhanced the difficulties of research-work among them.

index, more or less complete, and now more or less corresponding to the actual state and disposition of the records.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, there are in the Vatican Archives what is known as the "Miscellanea," documents collected in boxes or bound in volumes, varying greatly in date and character. One class of them, the *Miscellanea Instrumentorum*, is kept in *cassette* or small receptacles, classed chronologically. Three of these *cassette* contain documents previous to the year 1300.<sup>2</sup> The latest of them contain materials of quite modern history. They may be consulted by indicating the year or decade in question. Another class of these documents is called simply "Miscellanea"; according to M. Cauchie (op. cit., p. 289) there are more than two thousand volumes of them, mostly acquisitions made by the popes in modern times.<sup>3</sup>

The Archives of the papal Secretariate of State and the Borghese Archives have each an inventory. Though the former is a summary one, it acts as a guide to the enormous collection of nunciature reports since the Reformation. For France alone, it is rumored that more than 600 volumes of such documents are preserved, containing material of very miscellaneous character.<sup>4</sup>

The inventory of the State Department of the Holy See mentions also: "Lettere di Cardinali, vescovi, principi, particolari e soldati." There ought to be here a very rich harvest for the historian of man-

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Paul Fabre, "Note sur les archives du Château St. Ange, *Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome*," Avril, 1893. "Ce fonds contenait jadis les actes d'un procès de l'archevêque de Tolède au seizième siècle, Barthélémy Carranza, poursuivi par l'Inquisition d'Espagne," Guérard, op. cit., p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>For the history of the Vatican Archives and Library previous to that period see the researches of De Rossi and P. Ehrle.

<sup>3</sup>That our readers may see what "curiosa" are to be met with, even in these dustheaps of the Archives, I reprint the description given by Dr. Cauchie (after Dr. Schlecht) of the contents of one of the large cabinets (armoires) containing what is known as "Varia Politicorum." "En 1890, dit encore M. Cauchie, M. le docteur Schlecht a fait un dépouillement complet des 176 volumes qui portent ce nom. Il y a vu des paperasses de toutes espèces: des statistiques de l'administration des Etats pontificaux et parfois des autres gouvernements, des instructions aux envoyés du Saint Siège, des relations de nonces, des bulles et des brefs, des traités d'alliance, de guerre et de paix, les rapports des ambassadeurs vénitiens, des lettres envoyées ou reçues par des princes, des actes des Diètes et des Parlements, des décrets de souverains; des opuscules historiques, des catalogues des archives pontificales, des prières, des poèmes, des comédies, des énigmes, etc. . . . ; toutefois la politique fait l'objet principal de ces documents. Ils concernent surtout le XVIe et le XVIIe siècles, mais il y a aussi quelques pièces relatives aux âges antérieurs. En général, ce ne sont que des copies. Les autres mélanges ne sont pas moins bigarres: des papiers de nonciatures, des bulles, des édits, des ordonnances (Bandi), des actes de l'Inquisition, des ouvrages de théologie, des visitations, des actes relatifs aux ordres religieux, des diarii, des vies de papes, etc."

<sup>4</sup>These reports are now being (partially) published, especially those concerning Germany. A society has been established in France—the Archives de l'histoire religieuse de la France—with the avowed purpose of publishing these records, at least in analysis.

ners and institutions, as well as for the editors of "mémoires" and the writers of biographies from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup>

Cardinal Garampi (1725-1792), prefect of the Vatican Archives from 1751 to 1772, is responsible for a certain amount of classification of the materials of the Vatican Archives. It was his intention to compile an "Orbis Christianus" which would be for all Christendom what the "Gallia Christiana" was for France. For that purpose he compiled, or caused to be compiled<sup>2</sup> out of the various depositories of the Vatican Archives a certain number of general repertories of "notitiæ"—they were particularly drawn from the "Regesta" of papal bulls, and from the records of the "Camera Apostolica," although printed indications were not neglected. The paper notes or "fiches" on which were made the annotations that he sought are still preserved in the rooms of the sub-archivist, and are particularly useful for those seeking clearly defined materials. They are not inventories, strictly speaking, and in no wise represent a methodical and systematic dépouillement of the archives. The inventory of De Pretis was utilized in the collection of these raw materials for a general documentary church history. Under the headings—bishops, abbots, benefices, miscellanea, popes, cardinals, Roman churches, pontifical offices, Garampi put together fifty-three volumes which, with the twelve volumes of a chronological and the ten of an alphabetical index, form an important "first help" of some seventy-five volumes. If Garampi had examined completely some one of the several deposits of the Archives, and made an alphabetical index of his notes, his work would have been even yet indispensable. As it was, he only thought of the documents that were to appear in his projected "Orbis Christianus," and Fr. Conrad Eubel, the learned editor of the episcopal lists of Christendom since Innocent III., would have found his task considerably lightened. There was already an example in the labors of the contemporary Avignon archivists (Guérard, pp. 14-15) whose materials, however, were not then at the immediate disposal of Garampi. Such as they are, the "fiches" of Garampi no longer correspond with accuracy to the actual state of the Archives, or are in need of interpretation. M. Guérard furnishes useful directions to the research-student whose duty compels him to utilize these folios. It must be remembered that they were put together for the personal use of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. "Ricardo de Hinojosa, Los despachos della diplomacia pontificia en España," Madrid.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. D. Gregorio Palmieri, "Ad Vaticani archivii regesta RR. PP. manu-ductio," Roma, 1885, pp. xiv-xv.



Garampi, or at most, of his secretaries and the employés of the Archives. M. Guérard at the end of his instructive brochure, urges all research-students engaged at the Vatican in the editing of materials for local European history, to not wander from those that are indicated in the "fiches" of Garampi, the Avignon inventories and M. de Loye's inventory of the Camera Apostolica to the end of the fourteenth century. The personal examination of the entire huge mass of manuscript records could only be fruitful in case it covered a very large geographical field. In the future it will be easier to study at first hand Vatican materials for the fourteenth century, since the French School of History and Archæology at Rome has undertaken a complete assorting of all the "Regesta" for that period. In the meantime the historical student will profit greatly by the works of MM. Teige,<sup>1</sup> Tomaseth<sup>2</sup> and Tangl.<sup>3</sup>

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

**Origines du Culte Chrétien.** Etude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne. Par Mgr. L. Duchesne, Membre de l'Institut. 3d edition. Paris: Fontemoing, 1902. 8°, pp. 556.

As compared with the first edition of this admirable manual the third shows an increase of some fifty odd pages, distributed through the sixteen chapters of the work, and the hundred pages of appendixes. To the latter have been added the "Ordo Romanus" for the three days before Easter, and the Latin translation of the Canons of Hippolytus, the latter a welcome help to such as have not the work of Haneberg. For those who do not know this indispensable liturgical work we may say that it is divided into the following chapters: The Early Christian World (Christian communities; local churches; episcopal dioceses; ecclesiastical provinces, patriarchates, national churches), The Mass in the Orient, the Roman and the Gallican Liturgies, Liturgical books and formulæ, The Oldest Books of the Latin Liturgy, The Mass at Rome, The Gallican Mass, The Christian Feasts, Baptism, Ordination, Liturgical Dress, Dedication of Churches, Consecration of Virgins, Nuptial Blessing, Reconciliation of Penitents, The Divine Office.

<sup>1</sup> "Beitraege zum paepstlichen Kanzleiwesen des XIII und XIV Jahrhundert" (Mittheilungen des Instituts fuer österreichische Geschichtsforschung), Wien, 1896.

<sup>2</sup> "Die Register und Sekretaere Urbans V und Gregors XI" (ibid.), 1898.

<sup>3</sup> "Die paepstliche Register von Benedict XII bis Gregor XI" (Innsbruck), 1898. Cf. also the introduction and notes of Denifle, "Specimina palæografica Regestorum RR. PP.", Roma, 1888. The last two works, says M. Guérard (p. 13), give "le meilleur aperçu d'ensemble qui ait été donné jusqu'ici sur les registres du XIV siècle."



Mgr. Duchesne does not propose to exhibit in this work a portrait of ecclesiastical antiquities in general, but only of those which may be classed under the rubric of collective acts, acts of public interest to each local church, which are usually performed before its authorities and within its walls. Moreover, the work is strictly historical, dealing as a rule with the known attainable facts for each paragraph, and in the language of the original witnesses or what must pass for their evidence. Theological discussions and solutions would swell the book to an unwieldy volume—for such the reader is referred to the numerous learned books that deal with the same. Our author is concerned only with the general outlines of the public services of the Church as they appeared to the Christian eye from the fourth to the eighth century. Though Mgr. Duchesne disclaims any direct attempt at edification, let it be said that every priest will rise from the perusal of his learned book filled with a joyous faith, gifted with a satisfactory historic insight into the origins of the holy functions that he daily discharges.

"These ancient rites," he says (p. viii), "are doubly sacred; they come to us from God through Christ and the Church; even if they did not wear that halo, they would still be holy from their contact with the piety of a hundred generations. For so many centuries mankind has thus prayed to God! How many emotions, how many joys, how much affection, how many tears have these sacred books beheld, these rites and formulas made holy!"

Certainly no living historian is more capable than the Director of the French School of History and Archæology at Rome of throwing abundant light on the public services of Western Christianity in those four fateful centuries. The City of Rome is the living center of that worship from the days of Constantine, and this early mediæval Rome is almost the apanage of Mgr. Duchesne. Its bishops, its churches, its monuments and inscriptions, its institutions, customs and traditions, its hopes and fears, ideals and conflicts, its splendor and power, as well as its seamy and human side, are all an open book to the editor of the *Liber Pontificalis*. With him as guide we may learn to know and esteem all these liturgical "*Mirabilia Urbis Romæ*" that Charlemagne witnessed and Anglo-Saxon kings came from their island home to revere and imitate. It is the Rome of the "*Ordines Romani*," with its multitude of rare and curious survivals out of the earliest ages of the Christian religion, its inborn racial "*pietas*" toward the past, its sure sense of what was sober and decent in ritual, its inherited gravity and majesty that shine in all those holy rites which the ends of the earth still continue to borrow from her.

Teachers and students of mediæval history will profit much by mastery of this volume. Professors of theology, particularly of sacramental theology, will read it with equal profit, and all interested in the charming story of the Christian liturgy will draw from it both rare information and genuine edification. It deserves the compliment of translation into all the great vernaculars and particularly into English.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

**Ames Religieuses.** Par Henri Bremond. Paris: Perrin, 1902. 8°, pp. 284.

**L'Enfant et le Vie.** Par Henri Bremond. Paris: Retaux, 1902. 8°, pp. 278.

There is firmness at once and delicacy of touch in the literary manner of Fr. Bremond. Every new work from his pen reveals genuine merits of feeling, discernment, style, and a certain kindly intimate sympathy with the temper and the thought of the modern world. He has a definite message for his fellow-men, but he blends it with well-bred and shrewd conversation on the things they love and admire—literature, education, spiritual experience, the strong vivid play of personality. He finds no little that is good and admirable in the highly individualized religion of certain noble minds without the pale of the Church. One is moved to see the skill and sureness with which he extracts from the lives of John Keble, Edward Thring, Arnold of Rugby, and others, the lessons they offer to the men of his own France. After all, there is something un-Catholic and illiberal in excessive nationalism, something narrow and withering, a thinning down of the larger stream of general human interest and experience. In the writings of Fr. Bremond there is a marked reaction against such exclusivism and arrogance—*Je prends mon bien où il se trouve*—seems to be his motto. The volume on “L'Enfant et la Vie” contains so many tender and exquisite pages that, in spite of its miscellaneous character, every one interested in the Christian education of little children can read it with equal pleasure and profit.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

**Geschichte der Universitaet Dillingen (1549–1804) und der mit ihr verbundenen Lehr und Erziehungsanstalten.** Von Dr. Thomas Specht. Freiburg: Herder, 1902. 8°, pp. xv + 706.

This is a very conscientious, painstaking, instructive work—few of the modern special histories of universities surpass it for manifold suggestiveness. Dillingen was founded in 1549 by Cardinal Otto Truchsess, Bishop of Augsburg (1543–1573), one of the most

vigoro  
gestin  
about  
siastic  
was si  
III.  
passed  
until  
Speech  
for th  
ricula  
dent-li  
univers  
exister  
fessors  
be seen  
of repu  
Rassle  
lingen  
Schma  
the pr  
of an  
nies of  
Fro  
In the  
two an  
success  
ing out  
astical  
the fin  
Specht  
episcop  
the ma  
and a  
book, n  
meritor  
Unpub  
His  
edit  
The  
The  
colonial  
Scua

vigorous men of the Counter-Reformation. Not satisfied with suggesting and urging the Collegium Germanicum at Rome, he brought about (1549) the establishment in the town of Dillingen of an ecclesiastical academy or college under the patronage of St. Jerome, that was shortly (1551) raised to the dignity of a university by Julius III. Like several other German Catholic university schools, it soon passed (1563) into the hands of the Jesuits, who administered it until their suppression in 1773—two hundred and ten years. Dr. Specht follows out in close detail the general history of the school for this period, the organization of its faculties, its privileges, curricula of studies, administration, literary and scientific labors, student-life. We have in these pages the entire inner life of a Jesuit university of the eighteenth century. In the two centuries of its existence the theological faculty alone had over two hundred professors. Short terms and frequent changes were the order, as can be seen at once from the list of teachers. Among the theologians of repute were Hieronymus Torres, Gregory of Valentia, Christopher Rassler, Paul Laymann, Tobias Lohner, Alphonsus Pisanus. Dillingen enjoyed an excellent reputation for the study of canon law. Schmalzgrueber, Laymann, Pirhing, Pichler, taught here. Among the professors was the famous Irish Jesuit, Stephan White, author of an "Apologia pro Hibernia" (Dublin, 1849) against the calumnies of Gerald Barry.

From 1773 to 1804 Dillingen went through many vicissitudes. In the latter years it ceased to exist as a university, after more than two and a half centuries of activity. The Bavarian government, successor to the civil jurisdiction of the Bishops of Augsburg, carrying out the principles of the Napoleonic secularisation of the ecclesiastical properties, completed the ruin that had really begun with the financial crippling that followed the Thirty Years War. Dr. Specht gives a long list of valuable academic documents—papal and episcopal constitutions, instructions, bye-laws, programs. A list of the manuscript authorities (university records, faculty minutes, etc.) and a bibliography of printed works used in the compilation of the book, make it very serviceable for the intelligence of a small, but meritorious university.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

**Unpublished Letters of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and of His Father, Charles Carroll of Doughoregan.** Compiled and edited with a memoir by Thomas Meagher Field. New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society, 1902. Pp. 250. There are revealed in this volume of interesting letters phases of colonial life that have not come down to us in the pages of even

the most faithful and painstaking of historians; the appearance of this monograph is only another proof that if we wish to obtain an accurate notion of the past it is necessary to explore the sources of history. The more ample narratives of the era of the Revolution aim to sketch the principal characters and scenes of that eventful period, and while it is doubtless true that the philosophical student may perceive in their outlines men and things very much as they actually existed, the general reader will derive a more just conception by examining the original documents for himself.

Of all the memorials of those stirring times which have been discovered by either scholarship or patriotism the unpublished letters of Charles Carroll and those of his father form one of the most instructive and entertaining that have recently been offered to the public. From an examination of them we see clearly the mental equipment of one of the most amiable as well as one of the ablest of the Revolutionary leaders.

In his own generation, as in ours, Charles Carroll was known as a cultured and uncompromising patriot. He was likewise known to have had a firm grasp of the great constitutional questions which presented themselves to the consideration of his contemporaries. In what manner "The First Citizen" acquired this mastery of public affairs, however, is not so generally known. The letters included in the monograph before us show the successive stages in his development. Interesting as may be the contemplation of this and other questions, the impression which a reader of the letters will be likely to receive is that the younger Carroll was the product not so much of either French or English schools, for he enjoyed the benefits of both, as of a healthy American ancestry. His chief obligation was to the solicitude of an intelligent and Christian father, who carefully pointed out the value of sound religious principles. Not, indeed, in a didactic manner, like one who had only recently acquired them himself, but with the artlessness of one who held them in solution and who could not have written otherwise without doing violence to cherished convictions.

Even to those most familiar with our history the present volume introduces a character hitherto regarded as somewhat shadowy. Yet the correspondence of the elder Carroll shows him to have been anything but an insubstantial personage. He comes before us as a shrewd, generous and enlightened patriot profoundly interested in and fully comprehending all the public questions of his day. These qualities alone, however, would not have distinguished him from many of his contemporaries. It is his affectionate interest in everything designed to fit his son to adorn the station to which wealth and

talen  
to ou  
T  
erati  
and  
strom  
study  
prote  
to hi  
servi  
mind  
B  
harm  
we ca  
deed  
charm  
esting  
within  
pressi  
O'Car  
portion  
to a c  
class,  
with i  
spirit  
passed  
It  
or the  
by eve  
in the  
in the  
The  
raphy  
Society  
as upo  
Americ  
CAT  
Essen  
ler.  
The  
many o

talents invited him that gives Charles Carroll of Doughoregan a claim to our esteem.

Though the elder Carroll was not indifferent to worldly considerations, no sordid sentiment can be found in any of his numerous and unreserved communications to his son. If he manifested a strong desire that the future statesman should apply himself to the study of the law, it was not only that he might thereby the better protect his property interests but that he might be able also to give to his neighbors the benefit of sound legal advice. The thought of serving his fellowman appears never to have been absent from his mind.

Between two such men there was to be expected the most perfect harmony, and in the letters from the owner of Doughoregan Manor we catch no glimpse of even a momentary misunderstanding. Indeed it would be difficult to find elsewhere in colonial records so charming a picture of domestic life as that suggested by this interesting correspondence. While there were no elements of discord within, clouds were beginning to arise from without. British oppression had long before destroyed the rank and fortune of the O'Carrolls in Ireland. British intolerance, by imposing a double portion of taxes on Catholics, threatened once more to reduce them to a condition of poverty; but, fortunately for the people of every class, the illiberal policy which could discriminate against Catholics with impunity was soon applied to the entire population, and in the spirit of freedom aroused by the attempt the shadow of intolerance passed forever away.

It is not the purpose of this notice to describe either the contents or the character of this entertaining monograph. It would be spoiled by even a good paraphrase. We desire merely to interest the reader in the environment of one of the makers of this nation as well as in the home of a fine old Catholic gentleman of colonial times.

The volume forms a fitting supplement to Miss Rowland's biography of The Signer, and the United States Catholic Historical Society is to be congratulated as well upon its choice of an editor as upon the attractive appearance of this useful contribution to American history.

CHARLES P. MCCARTHY.

CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA.

---

**Essentials of American History.** By Thomas Bonaventure Lawler. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1902. Pp. 420, with index.

The competition among publishers and authors has produced many of the excellent text-books now in use in our schools, and,



perhaps, it is chiefly in respect of simplicity and clearness of arrangement that we are to look for their further improvement. Mr. Lawler makes no apology for offering to the public a new history of the United States. Indeed, to any student who is at the trouble of examining any considerable part of the work no apology is required.

Twenty pages of clear and interesting narrative summarize the achievements of the great navigators who appeared at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the succeeding century. Little that is new is seriously to be expected in any work on this era. Nevertheless, Mr. Lawler has imparted to his first chapter a freshness that makes it entertaining reading for even those who are familiar with the period of discovery.

In addition to the maps which usually illustrate this portion of our school histories there is contained in the present volume a chart of the trade routes between the commercial centers of Italy and the markets of India. It is only by some such aid that the young student can be made fully to comprehend the disastrous effect upon Genoese and Venetian trade of the taking of Constantinople. Though it is a commonplace of history to describe the flight of scholars after the fall of the venerable capital of the Eastern Empire, writers have not been accustomed to emphasize the influence of that event in giving character and direction to the nautical activity of the following century.

It is chiefly in the matter of style and arrangement that Mr. Lawler's account of the explorers differs from those given in most of the school histories now in use. It is not by the accumulation of detail but by a striking summary or a happy quotation that he shows himself qualified to prepare a history for the young. For example, the French method of acquiring supremacy in America is thus concisely described by an excerpt from Parkman: "Peaceful, benign, beneficent were the weapons of this conquest. France aimed to subdue not by the sword but by the cross; not to overwhelm and crush the nations. She invaded but to convert, to civilize and embrace them among her children."

Hand in hand with the work of the explorer went the labors of the missionary. A few well-written pages describe the efforts of these spiritual heroes. The roving character of the Indian tribes suggests the magnitude of the task undertaken by the Jesuits, and even if in this instance they failed to attain complete success they established by deeds of heroism unsurpassed in history a standard of character and of devotion to duty that will not soon pass into forgetfulness. The encouraging beginnings, as well as the causes of

the  
a sc  
V  
form  
is no  
emph  
many  
Amer  
respo  
F  
celler  
the v  
which  
of o  
where  
impor  
the s  
Morse  
prom  
as the  
atten  
of A  
chapt  
work

CA

Serm  
an  
Be  
It  
for th  
of the  
so tra  
be, to  
said o  
revere  
As  
some h  
a decis  
and fo  
that is



the decline of the California missions, receive for the first time in a school history anything like adequate treatment.

Without a tolerably complete account of the events preceeding the formation of the Constitution the story of our national development is not easy to write, and, as we may perceive by his distribution of emphasis, this difficulty Mr. Lawler appears fully to recognize. So many able and industrious writers have discussed this portion of American history, however, that it only remains to point out in what respect the present work differs from many of its predecessors.

First, the national period is duly emphasized. The number, excellence and accuracy of the maps is a very important feature of the work, and shows that the author is conscious of the relation which subsists between geography and history. The development of our unequalled system of transportation is well described and, where it is possible to do so, illustrated by interesting cuts. That the importance of our industrial history is not overlooked is apparent from the space devoted to the inventions of Whitney, McCormack, Howe, Morse, Edison and others. Economic and other reforms are given prominence in the narrative. The great financial measures, as well as the movements of population and their causes, receive considerable attention. The author adheres to his purpose to write the essentials of American history, for the summaries following his successive chapters mention only the conspicuous landmarks. In short, the work is admirably planned and ably executed.

CHARLES P. MCCARTHY.

CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA.

---

**Sermons from the Latins.** Adapted from Bellarmine, Segneri, and other sources, by Rev. James J. Baxter, D.D. New York: Benziger, 1902. 8°, pp. 618.

It is an almost excessive modesty that leads Dr. Baxter to claim for these sermons that they are only "adaptations." The material of them may, indeed, be taken "from the Latins," but it has been so transformed and so mingled with the author's own thought as to be, to all intents and purposes, his own. Therefore, whatever is said of this volume, in praise or blame, must be for the ears of the reverend preacher himself.

As a matter of fact, the sermons deserve not a little praise, and some blame. Some of the merits we have found in them are these: a decided originality, and sometimes, if not eloquence, at least, beauty and force of expression, a simplicity and vigor of diction, and much that is of doctrinal, ethical and practical value. The defects are

fewer: an occasional ineptitude of word or phrase; here and there a lapse from the specific, and exclusively sacred, character that befits pulpit utterances, some inconclusiveness of proof in certain controversial parts. In spite of these defects, the volume is easily superior to most of the current Catholic sermon books in English. It gives abundant evidence that the author is himself a man of personal original thought and that he has the power of begetting noble and useful thoughts in the mind of his hearers or readers. Not only is the book attractively made and printed, but each of the sixty sermons is provided with a synopsis.

**S. Jerome et la Vie du Moine Malchus le Captif.** Par Paul van den Ven, docteur en philosophie et lettres. Louvain: J. B. Istas, 1901. 8°, pp. 161.

The Vita Malchi, one of the most interesting of the hagiological writings of S. Jerome, is extant in Latin, Greek, and Syriac, each recension being represented by numerous MSS. In 1898, M. J. Kunze, professor of the History of Dogma at Leipzig, put forth the opinion that Jerome can no longer be considered as the original author of the Vita Malchi, that he merely translated it from a Greek or a Syriac text, adding to it a prologue of his own. In his learned monograph, Dr. Van den Ven refutes at length the arguments of the Leipzig professor. As Kunze neglected to consult the Greek text of the Vita Malchi and based his objections on a Latin translation of it, known as the Sirletto translation, Dr. Van den Ven begins his investigation with a thorough critical study of the Greek original. He edits it for the first time from three of the principal MSS. which contain it, viz.: Cod. Paris. gr. 1605 (XIIth century), Cod. Paris, gr. 1598 (A. D. 993), and Cod. Vat. gr. 1660 (A. D. 916). For the Syriac text he publishes from Add. 12175 (VIIth or VIIIth century) of the British Museum the fragment which is wanting in Sachau's edition of the Vita Malchi (Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, XXIII Band, Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften, Berlin, 1899, pp. 103-109). The Latin, Greek and Syriac recensions are referred to as H. G. and S, respectively. Dr. Van den Ven takes up in order the objections adduced by Kunze, and shows that they contain no valid reasons for denying to Jerome the original composition of the Vita Malchi. Not content with answering Kunze, he establishes his conclusions by arguments of his own and puts in clear light the incontestable literary superiority of H, the substitution in G and S of the direct oration for the indirect oration

of I  
in P  
stri  
man  
scrip  
Van  
the  
Syri  
H  
of sy  
Syri  
and  
order  
of th  
reach  
Gree  
and t  
nius  
the th  
graph  
critic

S. Hi  
ne  
Ca  
tis  
Ca

Th  
richest  
years  
a very  
efforts  
than h  
the gu  
Nazian

Dor  
is a tr  
quite n  
urged  
wants  
plete, a  
signs o

of H, the grouping together by G and S of details found scattered in H, the evident tendency in G and S to develop and amplify what strikes their fancy and appeals to their imagination, and finally the manifest allusion which the three recensions make to Vergil's description of the habits of ants (*Aen.*, IV, 402). From all this Dr. Van den Ven concludes that Jerome is really the original author of the *Vita Malchi*, which in turn served as a model to the Greek and Syriac compilers.

He shows, too, that S depends on G, as is clear from the similarity of syntactical construction and the abundance of Greek words in the Syriac text. The author might have dwelt on this at greater length and quoted instances of Greek words perhaps more to the point. In order to ascertain the author of G, Dr. Van den Ven makes a study of the *Vita Pauli Thebensis*, and of the *De viris inlustribus*. He reaches the conclusion that three different redactors translated into Greek the hagiologic writings of Jerome, and that the *Vita Malchi* and the *Vita Hilarionis* had a common translator, probably Sophronius (*De viris inlus.*, ch. CXXXIX). Dr. Van den Ven deserves the thanks of Latin, Greek and Syriac scholars for his learned monograph; it is a valuable contribution at once to philology, historical criticism and patrology.

ARTHUR A. VASCHALDE.

**S. Hieronymi Stridonensis Presbyteri Tractatus Contra Origenem de Visione Esaiae** quem nunc primum ex Codd. MSS. Casinensibus Ambrosius M. Amelli Monachus Archicoenobii Montis Casini in lucem edidit et illustravit. Tipografia di Monte Cassino, 1901.

The archives of Monte Cassino, it is well known, are one of the richest European depositories of ancient theological manuscripts. Two years ago the learned archivist, Don Ambrogio Amelli, made public a very interesting text, what he holds to be one of the very earliest efforts of Saint Jerome in the field of biblical theology—nothing less than his doctorate thesis, issued while at Constantinople in 381 as the guest and friend of the bishop of that city, Saint Gregory Nazianzen, and on the eve of becoming secretary of Pope Damasus.

Don Amelli is of opinion that the actual twelfth century codex is a transcription from a much older uncial codex that was written quite near the time of the author. Good palaeographical criteria are urged for this view, likewise for the opinion that the manuscript wants something "ulterius et vehementius," and is therefore incomplete, a view confirmed by the absence of the usual palaeographical signs of manuscript-ending. That the text is the work of Saint

Jerome seems to follow from the peculiar Hieronymian latinity, the critical and exegetical principles it follows, the well-known Hieronymian contention that Origen's interpretation of Isaias VI, 2, is impious, and the quality of the biblical text used. Moreover, Don Amelli believes that the text reveals in its first youthful outburst not only the ardent vivacious style, but the "præstantiam ingenii animique audaciam" which are characteristic of Saint Jerome. The opusculum was probably written in Greek. The original transcription of the present text was made by a Greek, or by some one poorly acquainted with Latin, doubtless some Byzantine or Calabrian monk, who copied out mechanically an almost coæval Latin translation that he found in an uncial manuscript, with its absence of word-separation and its ineffaceable evidences of having been taken down *more antiquo* from dictation. If this work be truly (and some yet doubt it) a new treatise of Saint Jerome, then some interesting data for the history of the Church and theology are gained from it. Thus Saint Jerome was an anti-Origenist in 381 and not first in 393; the famous negative definition of God is not first found in Saint Augustine (cf. op. cit., no. 4), but in Saint Jerome, unless both drew it from Clement of Alexandria; the Manichæan heresy was vigorous in New Rome in the latter quarter of the fourth century, hence the Theodosian rigors. Perhaps the most valuable lines of the manuscript are those that touch on the Roman Church. The author in discussing the orders of the angelic hierarchy, refers to the distinction of order in the Apostolic college, and asserts the supreme "principatus" of St. Peter.<sup>1</sup>

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

**Die Eschatologie des Buches Job.** Von Dr. Jakob Royer. Freiburg: Herder, 1901. Pp. 156. (Biblische Studien, vi, 5.)

**Abraham.** Von Dr. Paul Dornstetter. Freiburg: Herder, 1902. Pp. 278. (Biblische Studien, vii, 1-3.)

**Die Einheit der Apokalypse.** Von Dr. Matthias Kohlhofer. Freiburg: Herder. Pp. 143. (Biblische Studien, vii, 4.)

1. There is a perennial fascination in the book of Job, so sublime in its poesy, so poignant in the woe and perplexity of its hero. The author of this monograph has undertaken to see what light is thrown upon the life beyond the grave, by this inspired delineation of a soul wrestling with the problems of human suffering. He has come to the conclusion that Job—which he thinks was the work of Jeremias

<sup>1</sup> Nam et Apostoli cum ignorarent mensuram suam, et nescierunt quis quo major esset, dijudicati sunt a Domino, *Et ita Petro datus est principatus ut unusquisque suum ordinem possideret* (op. cit., no. 7, p. 14).

—teaches not only immortality but also—though somewhat dimly—the continuation after death of the relations of the just with God, and the hope of their release from Sheol. Moreover, Dr. Royer adds another to the expositors who find in the well-known passage (xix, 23-27), the doctrine of the resurrection. Certainly this obscure puzzling text bears this meaning with at least as much probability as others given it. But the last word on the *crux*—if there will be a last word—shall depend on the right view of Job as a whole, and the answer to the queries: is the book a unit, and if so, does its tenor comport with advanced ideas of the future life? There are many who deny one or both. Meanwhile, we have a right to hold to the traditional interpretation. This is strengthened by Dr. Royer's exegesis, but remnants of doubt are still left clinging to it. With the exception of a few ill-founded statements, such as the assertion of a tradition of judgment after death among the Babylonians, Dr. Royer's work is a solid addition to the literature of Job.

2. Must Abraham be relegated to the region of myths? Cornill is alone among the advanced German critics in saying nay. The question is one with which Christian apology is closely concerned, for Israel by the flesh and that of the spirit alike trace their descent from this patriarch. Dr. Dornstetter's 278 pages are not too many for a theme of such importance. He defends the historicity of the Abraham narrative, and has brought a wealth of reading and patient research to his task. He upholds piece by piece, all the details of the history attacked by the adversaries. Most of the discussion centers about names of places, men and tribes. Much space and effort is given to adjusting the biblical chronology with the data of Babylonian and Egyptian discoveries. The author brings into requisition the conclusions of the archaeologists Sayce and Hommel, but their judgment is apt to be warped by their anti-critical stand, and on many points they have the cocksureness justly blamed upon some biblical critics. A copious bibliography ends the book. It is a stanchly conservative essay, but like other of its class, has the fault in seeing but error in the ranks of criticism.

3. The Apocalypse was a stumbling stone to a number of Christian fathers and doctors of the early centuries. Antioch's literal school of exegesis, including Saint John Chrysostom, could make nothing clear or intelligible out of it or the Apocrypha. Its visions and mysteries furnish apt material for heretical vagaries, and this was another cause of its long eclipse in parts of the Orient. Modern biblical criticism has stumbled at this enigmatical book. Not that the critics concern themselves with its inner meaning, but they would

make it a curious patchwork or mixture containing various elements, Jewish, Judeo-Christian, Gnostic or Babylonian, according to the presuppositions or idiosyncrasies of the analyzers. But the marked lack of agreement in their results offers a strong point to the defenders of the book's unity, and strongly suggests much subjectivity in the critical enterprises. In "Die Einheit der Apokalypse" the arguments of the assailants of its unity are scrutinized, and the objections answered in detail, and in general, effectively. In view of a kind of family resemblance between the New Testament book of Revelations and pre-Christian apocalypses or apocalyptic visions, the interesting question suggests itself: is the supernatural character of its visions compatible with an influence of older apocalyptic passages? In other words, did the revelations vouchsafed to St. John at Patmos, before their ultimate perception by him, pass through a medium, formed by his mental state, and in so doing assimilate something of their mental form and color from a fullness of Old Testament and Hebraic thought there. The author does not go into this question though hinting (pp. 65, 66, 70) that some of the images may have been drawn from the older sacred literature. Certainly, the phraseology at least of this book of mysteries savors strongly of the Old Testament.

GEORGE J. REID.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

**The Literature of American History.** A Bibliographical Guide, in which the scope, character and comparative worth of books in selected lists are set forth in brief notes by critics of authority. Edited for the Am. Library Association by J. N. Larned. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1902. 8°, pp. ix + 596.

Many hands have contributed to this bibliography of 4,155 numbers. Under the rubrics, America at large, The United States, the United States by Sections, Canada, Spanish and Portugese America, The West Indies, the reader will find a *catalogue raisonné* of a choice library of Americana, drawn up by forty capable scholars, many of them life-long students of the department assigned to their industry. The late Paul Leicester Ford contributes thirteen pages of a syllabus of existing materials for the study of American history that makes excellent reading, even for those who are no longer beginners. Each writer is responsible, over his initials, for the brief characterization of the works he treats. From a Catholic point of view the omissions are many, nor are they slight and unimportant. Thus, no account is taken of the numerous diocesan histories published by Catholics, nor is Finotti's unfinished "Bibliographia Catholica Americana"

ment  
scienc  
It wo  
ment  
in 19

Etud

W

T

origin

Domi

bourg

vital

the t

wishe

will a

his o

The

canon

next

natur

expla

unive

the c

whiel

kind.

Our

"Son

who o

Dieu,

the v

Sonsl

Réde

expia

Toml

accou

the h

S

thoug

used

his M



mentioned. Possibly we are ourselves somewhat to blame, since the science of bibliography does not count many devotees among us. It would be unfair to pass final judgment on this work as a "Supplement" is promised, that, however, will contain only works published in 1900 and 1901.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

**Etudes Sur Les Evangiles.** Par le Père V. Rose, O.P. Paris: Welter, 1902. Pp. xiv + 336.

This little volume is mainly a reprint of articles, which appeared originally in the *Revue Biblique*. The author is the learned Dominican who fills the chair of exegesis at the University of Fribourg. He defends, in a rigidly critical and scientific manner, the vital truths of the Gospel assailed by the rationalistic criticism of the time. The work is concisely done—indeed, here and there one wishes a greater fullness of the argument—but every impartial reader will acknowledge that it is well done, and that the apologist meets his opponents on their own ground and with their own weapons. The first chapter, *La Tétramorphe*, is a defense of the primitive canonicity of the four Gospels against Harnack's allegations. In the next the credibility of Matthew and Luke's narrative of the supernatural conception is vindicated; the silence of the other evangelists explained. The Kingdom of God is then treated; its spirituality and universality are proven by the words and actions of Jesus. Under the caption, *Le Père Céleste*, the writer deals with the new relations which the Redeemer established between God the Father and mankind. The fifth chapter, *Fils de l'Homme*, discusses the problem of Our Lord's reserve regarding his Messiahship, and contends that the "Son of Man" was a veiled title of the Messiah, significant to those who entered into Christ's idea of the Kingdom. In the next, *Fils de Dieu*, the inner divine nature of the Messiah's person is evinced by the words of Jesus himself, and the pre-temporal character of his Sonship deduced from the testimonies of the evangelists. *La Rédemption* is the title of a chapter devoted to Jesus' virtues, to the expiatory and vicarious nature of his redeeming Act. Finally, in *Le Tombeau trouvé*, Fr. Rose attempts to reconcile the two types of accounts of Christ's apparitions after the Resurrection, and vindicates the historic value of the evidences of this miracle.

Some views enunciated in these *Etudes* have an unfamiliar sound, though they are not hereby condemned. For instance, we are not used to be told by Catholic theologians that Jesus did not proclaim his Messiahship until the end of the Galilean ministry; that the name

"Son of God" as given to our Lord by the celestial voices, the angels, demons and apostles, connotes nothing more than the Messiahship. The Resurrection is retired to a secondary place in Christian evidences. Fr. Rose thinks that he would be but a blundering apologist who would lead an unbeliever to the empty sepulchre, without having prepared his mind by revealing Christ's teaching about himself. The rationalist critics are always adducing the consciousness of Jesus; it is to this that that our author appeals, first of all; it is the foundation of his "apologetic." With a clearness, brevity and perspicacity that leave little to be desired, Father Rose strips Christ's self-testimony, and the witness of the evangelists, of the disguise thrown about them by the adversaries, whom he convicts of error by the voice of their self-chosen tribunal.

GEORGE J. REID.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

**Staatslexicon.** Edited by Dr. Julius Bachem. (2d ed.) Freiburg: Herder, 1902. Vol. III, Hegel to Mormonen.

The preceding volumes of this admirable Staatslexicon have been already noticed in the BULLETIN (April, 1902). The third volume contains many very interesting articles which appear in the order required by the German alphabet. We might mention in particular: Kapital und Kapitalismus, Lehrlings und Gesellenwesen, Kartelle, Monopol, Lohn; the biographical sketches of Bishop von Ketteler, Malinckrodt, de Lammenais, Montalembert; and the articles on Kirche und Staat, Liberalismus, Kulturkampf. The entire volume is characterized, as are volumes I and II by methodical exposition, completeness and sufficient bibliographical indications.

The great service that a work like this may render is understood when we note that an intelligent grouping of articles gives one a complete view of all questions within its scope. True, the studies are not exhaustive nor technical. In such a work, they cannot be. But the thoughtful reader will find them complete enough for every general purpose. The dependence of volume on volume and of article on article, prevents one from reviewing single volumes satisfactorily. They will be noticed as they appear. When the final volume is published, a general review of the whole work may be of service. The work merits generous support from the Catholics of the United States who are familiar with German.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Social

M

TH

occasi

but r

sary

stand

Popu

and

Truth

Churc

Myste

W

unity

whate

ume

enthu

and t

Patri

admin

Bisho

on th

us in

have

not a

Never

with

of the

new i

welco

guida

CI

of the

caree

ing's

is a s

forces

It

ing's

may

time,

public

**Socialism and Labor.** By Bishop Spalding. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 225.

This new volume by Bishop Spalding is a compilation of some occasional addresses together with a number of chapters which are but remotely related. The variety of the contents makes it necessary to state the titles of chapters, in order that the reader understand the scope of the volume: Socialism and Labor; The Basis of Popular Government; Are We in Danger of Revolution? Charity and Justice; Woman and the Christian Religion; Emotion and Truth; Education and Patriotism; Assassination and Anarchy; Church and Country; Labor and Capital; Work and Leisure; The Mystery of Pain; An Orator and Lover of Justice; St. Bede.

While the personality of the author is the chief bond which gives unity to the work, the multitudes who love to read and who admire whatever Bishop Spalding writes, will be anxious to possess this volume because it is from his pen, and they will find in it the optimism, enthusiasm and hope which characterize him. The chapters "Woman and the Christian Religion," "Emotion and Truth," "Education and Patriotism," "Work and Leisure" and "The Mystery of Pain" are admirable. One would recognize them as the work of the scholarly Bishop of Peoria, no matter where one found them. The chapters on the general phases of the social question present the author to us in a new rôle. One feels at a first reading that these chapters have not taken on the imprint of the author's personality. We are not accustomed to meeting him in the field of statistics and economics. Nevertheless, the treatment of the questions shows a wide acquaintance with the elements of the social problem and an accurate appreciation of the psychological forces in it. There is possibly not much that is new in the treatment, yet all of the author's admirers will heartily welcome this expression of his views and will undoubtedly receive guidance from it.

Chapter XIII, "An Orator and Lover of Justice," is a discussion of the character of Altgeld. Possibly some who followed the political career of this remarkable man will hardly agree with Bishop Spalding's high estimate of Governor Altgeld; but waiving that, the address is a splendid analysis of character and a subtle appreciation of the forces that manifest themselves in the life of a leader.

It may not be out of place to express the hope that Bishop Spalding's work as a member of the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission may later impel him to publish more on the labor question. Meantime, this little volume will not fail to add to his reputation as a public spirited man and a teacher of rare power.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

**A Short History of the Christian Church** for students and general readers. By John W. Monerief. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1902. 8°, pp. 458.

Some books are reviewed because of intrinsic merit. The only claim of this one to recognition is the position of its author as Associate Professor of Church History in the University of Chicago. Of course it has some merits. It could hardly fail to have them, coming, as it does, from such a source. But in general, its author has failed to write anything new in thought or method, and has marred his work by an occasional ignorance simply astounding, and a more frequent display of bigotry, which is nothing less than insulting to the Catholic students in the University of Chicago.

In the space at our disposal we can notice only a few points. To begin with the bibliography. It is certainly pretentious, though any of Professor Monerief's students could have done as well, and doubtless with more modesty, not to say fairness. Catholic sources are rarely mentioned, and always with the adjective "Romanist" or some signal to make the average non-Catholic reader shy of reading them. In fact, one cannot resist the suspicion that the author never read most of the books cited; otherwise it is hard to understand some of the ridiculous views put forth by him. For instance, speaking of monasticism, he puts down the following as its "psychological cause": "The deep desire planted in the soul to escape contamination is universal. This led the heathen to believe that matter and sense are essentially evil—and the Christian to the same conclusion." Merely this and nothing more. Professor Monerief as a philosopher of history is certainly unique. We do know of a widespread sect, half pagan and half Christian, known as Manichæism, which did hold matter to be essentially evil. But it is news indeed, to learn that the cultured Greek held the same, and downright astounding to find a similar belief attributed to Christians universally, to men and women who believed in a resurrection of the body and condemned Manichæism as a heresy. As for monasticism, has Professor Monerief ever read of St. Francis of Assisi or St. Catharine of Siena, whose greatest delight was to wander through the fields and pluck wild flowers and talk to the birds and weave garlands of daisies and sing for very joy of being close to nature? Farther on this writer (p. 153) seems less confident in his theory, and so he advances another "psychological cause" no less wonderful: "In monasticism, with all its perversions and later corruptions, we have a foregleam of the Reformation" because it was "a great protest of the individual" against a decaying constitutional church.

By th  
tially  
perha  
classe  
amon  
Surel  
And  
wheth  
the R  
Mode  
five t  
Catha  
with  
ormat  
contin  
not h  
be it  
solem

Le  
to pa  
right  
staten  
ciples  
Catho  
challe  
would  
Schoo  
words  
printe  
one o  
a styl  
izatio  
them  
Howe  
ciples  
be fo  
stigm  
Th  
mildl  
ciples  
page  
ship.

By this reasoning then the belief that "matter and sense are essentially evil" was a "foregleam of the Reformation." The author, perhaps, will object to such a logical deduction because (p. 306) he classes "Luther's marriage to Catherine von Bora—an escaped nun" among the notable "events indicating the progress of reform." Surely, there was no contempt of matter in that *affaire du coeur*. And Luther were the last to despise matter or the enjoyment of it whether as "wine, women or song." Speaking of this "idyll" of the Reformation, we offer a suggestion to our author. He commences *Modern Church History* (p. 34) with the "posting of the ninety-five theses" of Luther. Would it not be better to begin it with Catharine's escape from the convent, or at least, with her marriage with Luther? That would have the advantage of linking the Reformation with Monasticism and Manichæism, giving it a logical continuity, so to speak, with antiquity. We trust the reader will not hold us guilty of levity in throwing out this suggestion. Far be it from us to be otherwise than solemn in dealing with such a solemn subject.

Leaving the higher atmosphere of philosophy and coming down to particular facts, we are sorry to hold the author guilty of downright slander. One need only be a gentleman to brand as such the statement concerning the Jesuits (p. 364) that "among their principles we find the following: the end justifies the means." As Catholics, Jesuits could not hold such a principle, and we formally challenge Professor Moncrief to produce evidence that they do. We would not be surprised to read such a slander in a penny Sunday School paper, published in some backwoods village, but we have no words with which to properly express our contempt when finding it printed in a *Church History*, written by an Associate Professor in one of our leading universities. It was our impression that such a style of controversy was out-of-date, but it would seem that civilization among some people has not progressed far enough to make them abandon the use of chain-shot and dumdum bullets in warfare. However much Professor Moncrief may disapprove of Jesuit principles, he ought at least give them the credit of being too wise to be fools, and too upright individually, to hold a principle which is stigmatized by all honorable men of every religious belief.

The author's acquaintance with Catholic doctrine is, to put it mildly, not profound. Even the simplest, most elementary principles of Catholic belief are misinterpreted or unknown. Thus on page 251 we read of "worship of the Blessed Virgin," "Saint worship." Now, no Catholic ever did or does now "worship" anyone

but God. Worship, as used nowadays, means adoration, and Professor Monerief is strangely ignorant if he does not know so. At least, his wording is ambiguous and misleading.

Likewise (p. 422), he evinces a fundamental ignorance of the meaning of Papal Infallibility, when he triumphantly writes of the decree restoring the Jesuits: "This infallible decree repudiates the infallible decree of Clement XIV (1771) which forbade the restoration of the Jesuits forever." Now this is simply astounding. Any child in a parochial school in Chicago could tell Professor Monerief that Papal Infallibility concerns only teaching of faith and morals, and not such cases as the actual erection or dissolution of a religious society, which acts are purely disciplinary.

Throughout most of the book, however, the author is not more bigoted than many other Protestant writers of popular text-books. He is merely more than usually ignorant. But in his treatment of modern Catholicity he passes the bounds of decency. Of Leo XIII he thus speaks (p. 427): "As we follow the subtle movements of this pope, and see that when he here and there yields a secondary matter it is only that he may gain a point of greater importance, and when we see him stirring up strife within nations and between nations, with a view to personal advantage, and see, too, his minions going to all the ends of civilization," etc. Then of Rome in general, "we reluctantly admit the truth of Rector Schwab's statement in his introduction to Nippold's *Papacy in the Nineteenth Century* 'True; we need no longer fear bodily harm. . . . But are there not other considerations. . . . Is not the possibility of national decay something to care about? The danger from the Church of Rome to-day is not the stake or torture; but it is the danger from insidious moral and spiritual forces threatening to stop a nation's progress, to corrupt a nation's ethical standard, to darken a nation's intellect. The greatest task which God has appointed to the religious forces of this country is to build up a government in city, state and nation which shall be pure and just; and the papal system is the most determined enemy to the accomplishment of this task.' " These are incendiary utterances, and they bring this manual beneath the ordinary level of its kind.

At the sight of such ignorance and bigotry in the person of an associate professor of the University of Chicago, one cannot help asking himself if this be the best product of Chicago culture. The dedication to Eri Baker Hulbert, Professor of History in the same university, whom the author admiringly terms his "faithful friend and wise counsellor," would suggest that the department of history

in ge  
schol  
Ho  
stud  
course  
versity  
and o  
would

No

First

S.J.

Practi

Tw

Sy

Th

Forty-

By

tet

Earth

B.

1.

Societ

Upon

These

spiritu

charac

with

about

writin

touch

uals o

to res

eral t

adorn

suppli

refere

St. Th

and a

courag

9cu



in general was not unsympathetic, even though the average of scholarship might be higher than that displayed by the author.

However this may be, one thing is clear, to wit, that Catholic students in the University of Chicago would do well to select their courses with discrimination; or still better, to attend a Catholic university, where they can be sure of not hearing their faith slandered and of making a more reliable course in ecclesiastical history than would seem to be accessible on the shores of Lake Michigan.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE, BALTIMORE.

---

**First Lessons in the Science of the Saints.** By R. J. Meyer, S.J. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1902. Pp. 320.

**Practical Preaching for Priests and People** (Second Series): Twenty-five Plain Catholic Sermons on Useful Subjects, with a Synopsis of Each Sermon. By Fr. Clement Holland. London: Thomas Baker, 1902. Pp. 422.

**Forty-five Sermons**, Written to Meet Objections of the Present Day. By Rev. James McKernan. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co., 1902. Pp. 291.

**Earth to Heaven.** By Monsignor John Vaughan. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1902. Pp. 184.

1. Father Meyer's position of prominence and authority in the Society of Jesus bespeaks for his new volume a respectful attention. Upon examination the reader will find his anticipations realized. These pages give abundant evidence of faithful study of approved spiritual teachers, of close acquaintance with the vagaries of human character, and of a zealous longing to inspire ordinary Christians with the ambition of holiness. The volume is adapted to reach about the same class of readers as that to which Father Faber's writings were addressed; the subjects treated are the ones usually touched upon in Retreat Conferences, Treatises on Perfection, Manuals of the Virtues, and the like; but while the writer may be said to resemble Father Faber in directness, in earnestness and in general temper, his plainness is in contrast with the poetic fervor and adornment of the popular Oratorian's writings. The chapters are supplied with ample proof of doctrinal soundness, in the form of references to such authorities as St. Ignatius, St. Francis de Sales, St. Thomas and Suarez. Simple language, a fairly interesting style and a mildy philosophic tone, form characteristics that should encourage the prospective reader.

2. An admirable point about Father Holland's Sermons—a characteristic that will recommend the book especially to a busy, quick-thinking priest—is the little synopsis that stands at the head of each discourse. As to the sermons themselves, there is a good deal of practical common sense interwoven with the treatment of the moral and doctrinal subjects, some of the sermons being composed quite in the missionary's vein. In point of elegance they yield the palm to other compositions, but, of course, they have been directed to the attainment of a more practical end than the production of elaborately constructed periods.

3. Father McKernan's contribution of forty-five sermons should be a useful acquisition to both priests and laity. The author has paid almost exclusive attention to objections nowadays current against the faith; over against the positions and the arguments of those who assail or doubt Catholic doctrines he places the Church's teaching and the reasons that support it. Brevity, simplicity and ardent faith are apparent in his pages. It is in the devotional sermons, however, that his best work seems to have been done. One notices with some regret the lack of a devotional sermon on the Blessed Sacrament, though—perhaps in compensation—there is a good one on the Holy Name. Oftentimes a careful and fervent exhortation on the Blessed Sacrament will profit both the good and the bad, both the faithful and the unbeliever, far more than a most learned discourse in proof of transubstantiation.

4. In Mgr. Vaughan's sermons one discovers a very noticeable concern as to matters rhetorical. We make this comment not by way of reproach but rather as a commendation. For though he does not always succeed in escaping the pitfalls that beset the "fine writer," yet he does attain to a varied excellence that furthers him in his endeavor to fix attention upon the doctrinal truths he is exposing. His language is figurative, lively, vivid; he employs entertaining allusions and illustrations; he is brief, positive and clear. It is in the non-controversial sermons, however, that he appears to be most successful; his genius runs rather to explanation than to argument; he preaches more effectively than he demonstrates. In the preface contributed by the Bishop of Emmaus are some rather unintelligible sentences due no doubt to an oversight in the proof-reading.

J. MCSORLEY.

ST. THOMAS COLLEGE,  
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

The

Ne

Fa

teachi

orate

as an

Most

humili

mirabl

and pi

of the

The la

pedago

a good

host of

wholes

tunate,

spiritu

what he

Spirit,

possibil

The Si

Alex

Edit

Part

latic

The

editing

British

an editi

Antioch

This edi

known

present

lation of

Part II

as possib

will follo

The I

in Greek

**The Harmony of the Religious Life.** By Herman J. Heuser.

New York: Benziger Bros., 1902. 8°, pp. —.

Father Heuser's book is intended for religious belonging to teaching communities. It is constructed in the manner of an elaborate allegory wherein the religious life and virtues are conceived as an organ built to give melodious expression to worship of the Most High. This novel conveyance for the ever-old lessons of humility, patience, poverty and obedience, serves its purpose admirably. It appeals to one with something of the quaintness, force and picturesqueness of an Oriental parable, and recalls the wisdom of the householder who has at command both new things and old. The latter pages of the book are taken up with counsels of Christian pedagogy. For these alone, we should have to thank the author for a good, strong, stimulating work. Fortunate it will be for the great host of children now in our parochial schools, if they are given the wholesome training for which Father Heuser makes a plea. Fortunate, too, those teachers who will assimilate the deep and truly spiritual principles which he lays down for the accomplishing of what he calls "a continuous creation through the action of the Divine Spirit," the unfolding of the natural faculties and supernatural possibilities which God has hidden in the mind and heart of a child.

JOSEPH MCSORLEY.

**The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, Patriarch of**

**Alexandria,** in the Syriac version of Athanasius of Nisibis.

Edited and translated by E. W. Brooks, M.A. Vol. I (Text),

Part I. London and Oxford: published for the Text and Translation Society by Williams and Norgate, 1902. Pp. ix + 259.

The Text and Translation Society, established for the purpose of editing and translating the Oriental Texts chiefly preserved at the British Museum, issues as the first number of its series of publications an edition of the sixth book of the select letters of Severus of Antioch (539) in the Syriac version of Athanasius of Nisibis (684). This edition is the work of E. W. Brooks, a scholar already will known for his excellent contributions to Syriac literature. The present volume contains Part I of the Syriac text, the English translation of which will appear about Easter. Part II of the text and Part II of the translation will be published in as quick succession as possible, and an introduction dealing with the work of Severus will follow with the translation.

The Letters of Severus of Antioch, lost except for a few fragments in Greek, are preserved in at least three Syriac versions; of these,

two are represented by a few isolated letters or fragments; but of the third, that of Athanasius of Nisibis, the sixth book is found almost complete in two Syriac MSS. of the British Museum, viz. Add. 12181 and Add. 14600, both of the eighth century. Brooks' edition is based on these two MSS., to which he refers as A, B, respectively. Variant readings are given from Add. 12154 of the British Museum (about A. D. 800), and from Cod. Paris Syr. 62 of the ninth century. The Greek fragments which are extant are also published in full.

The first part of the text contains, besides the Syriac preface and headings, 66 letters, 63 in Section I (pp. 1-221) and 3 in Section II (pp. 222-231). These letters throw considerable light on the work and influence of Severus of Antioch whom Tillemont calls "the second founder of the Eutychian heresy (*Mémoires*, XVI, 682). They certainly confirm what we know of his opposition to Nestorianism (p. 42), and of his bitter hatred towards St. Flavian of Antioch, to whom he refers as "a trafficker in divine things" (p. 145). Seven of the letters are addressed to different parties in Apamea, and two to the archimandrite of Mar Bassus, a monastery which was a hotbed of Monophysitism in the first quarter of the sixth century. The majority of the letters deal with points of ecclesiastical discipline; such is the letter of Philoxenus of Mabbôgh (No. 48) asking his advice as to whether those who had received ordination in consideration of temporal gifts should be granted absolution, upon their plea of ignorance of the canons, the letter to Eustace the presbyter (No. 35) telling him that a slave cannot be ordained priest, until he has secured his freedom, the letter to Dionysius of Tarsus (No. 33) advising him to act leniently with a priest who was possessed of the devil, but not to allow him to minister at the altar. This suffices to show the wide range of topics covered by the letters as well as their importance for the student of Church History. Mr. Brooks is entitled to the gratitude of all scholars for placing within their reach the hitherto inaccessible letters of Severus of Antioch. Taking this volume as an index of those that will follow, we may bespeak a hearty welcome to the future publications of the Text and Translation Society.

ARTHUR VASCHALDE.

**The Relation of Experimental Psychology to Philosophy.** By Mgr. Désiré Mercier. Translated by Rev. Edmund J. Wirth, Ph.D., D.D. New York: Benziger Bros., 1902. Pp. 62.

Dr. Wirth gives us in this little volume an English version of a lecture delivered before the Royal Belgian Academy by the well-known professor of philosophy in the University of Louvain. Both

the or  
circle  
been l  
Altho  
oughl  
contac  
clearl  
psych  
the ro  
uable  
who is  
result  
sirable  
so mu  
and w  
movem

The M  
Co.

Mr.  
i. e., th  
read it  
paper  
note; h  
well is  
blunder  
movem  
free fr  
Then t  
notes, t  
one of  
an unu  
keeps a  
finding  
point of  
are said  
ments a  
ignorant  
does not  
rect, fai  
in doing  
NOTE

the original and the translation are useful; they place before a large circle of readers the real value of a science which has not always been looked on with favor by adherents of the spiritualistic philosophy. Although it was not possible within the limits of a lecture to thoroughly discuss any of the problems at issue, the principal points of contact between experimental results and philosophical principles are clearly indicated. The general conclusion is that experimental psychology, far from justifying the materialistic position "widens the road of progress for true philosophy and furnishes it with valuable information." It is interesting to read this verdict from one who is a recognized authority on Scholasticism; and, doubtless, the result for many minds will be that surpassing peace which is desirable. At the same time, it would be worth while asking just why so much "valuable information" should be of the important sort, and why the true philosophy should be content to follow scientific movements which are inaugurated under foreign auspices.

E. A. PACE.

**The Middle Ages.** Philip Van Ness Myers. New York: Ginn & Co., 1902. 8°, pp. vi + 454.

Mr. Myers possesses in a marked degree the art of book-making, *i. e.*, the art of making a book so attractive that it is a pleasure to read it, nay even to look at it, to feel it. He knows the best kind of paper and binding and print; just where to place a map or a footnote; his ability to pack a whole century into a few pages and do it well is marvellous. And though he is not learned and makes many blunders he has that rare knack of picking out the chief events—movements from the tangled web of history—and presenting them free from minor events which might tend to confuse the reader. Then too he hits upon very excellent books in his bibliographical notes, though his own text does not show great research. In this, one of his numerous books, all these excellent qualities are found in an unusual degree. It is one of those little histories which one keeps around him for quick reference, because he is always sure of finding what he wants quickly and said clearly. From a controversial point of view we should call the work moderate. Occasionally things are said offensively, nor is the author always correct in his statements as to Catholic positions. But such blunders are due more to ignorance than ill will. Because, as above said, Mr. Myers is not and does not pretend to be scientific. His aim is to compile a tolerably correct, fair and very readable work, and we must say he has succeeded in doing so.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE, BALTIMORE.

**Œuvres Oratoires de Bossuet.** Edition critique complète, par l'abbé J. Lebarq, Docteur es-lettres, Vol. I-VII. Lille: Desclée De Brouwer et Cie, 1890-1897. 8°. 38 francs.

Our readers will scarcely be displeased that, somewhat tardily it is true, we bring to their knowledge this valuable publication of the late abbé Lebarq. It seems incredible that for the first time the sermons of Bossuet lie before us in a text as like as possible to that which he wrote or preached. It seems still more incredible that so little remains—two hundred and thirty-five sermons—of the fifty-four years of his magisterial preaching (1648-1702). Nevertheless, we welcome these precious volumes that contain the output of the most sublime of modern Christian minds, a mind very clear, simple and logical, that seemed bathed always in an atmosphere of doctrinal intelligence and elevation. He was one of the makers of that great weapon of human activity—the French language. In his hands it was made to express with precision and fulness whatever was true, pure, universal, of general human interest. He created the language of philosophical history, and, first since St. Augustine, outlined with massive strength and perfect sense of proportion, a consistent philosophy of history. He is truly the Michael Angelo of history, before whose vision only the majestic, the grandiose, the divine, find favor, whose spirit seems always touched with an apocalyptic fire, that shines in his phrase with celestial warmth and sweetness.

In his life time only one sermon appeared with his full approbation, that on the Unity of the Church, preached at the opening of the famous Assembly of 1682. Already, indeed, his six great funeral orations had been printed, but under pressure from the Court; a seventh, that on Anne of Austria, seems lost forever. Not until 1772-1778 was a complete collection of his sermons printed by the Benedictine Deforis, from manuscripts that had come down in the family of Bossuet. The methods and principles of this edition—whose content, strangely enough, has never been increased—were very faulty from the view-point of modern exact scholarship. Nor is the edition of 1815 to be regarded as superior. The Lachat edition (1862-1864) furnished M. Lebarq with no little material for criticism in his "*Histoire Critique de la prédication de Bossuet*" (Paris, 1889). In the partial editions of Gandar, Gazier, Brunetière, Rébelliau, judgment and science seem to have dealt, for the first time, with the text of the Eagle of Meaux. The editions of Bar-le-Duc (1870) Paris (1870-74) Lyons (1877) have no merit of their own—M. Lebarq declares them "replicas" in various proportions of the editions of 1815, Gandar and Lachat.



Each sermon in this edition, is placed in its historical "milieu." Philosophical and historical notes accompany the text. Besides a useful introduction there are several pages on the grammar of Bossuet. A seventh volume contains a complete index, and each volume is provided with a concordance that permits comparison with all previous editions. The volumes are printed in large and fresh type, and offer also specimens of the handwriting of Bossuet, as well as portraits of the great orator. Five of the volumes contain his sermons before 1670. One is sufficient for all that is left of the active episcopal life of Bossuet from 1670 to 1704; a space of thirty-four years. What would we not give for the full content of those years, his sermons at Meaux, in the villages of his diocese, to his priests and nuns, the occasional discourses of so varied a calling! Henceforth, the sermons of Bossuet must be read and cited in this edition. It is a monument put up by the nineteenth century to the memory of one who has been called, nor without reason "the last of the fathers."

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

**The Letters of St. Teresa.** Translated from the Spanish by the Rev. John Dalton. London: Thomas Baker, 1 Soho Square, 1902. 8°, pp. 304.

The value of private letters as a means of effecting intimate acquaintance with historic personages had been remarked time and again—never more truly than in the case of Saint Teresa. Without her letters the Autobiography and the Book of Foundations lose their significance in great measure; with them we are able to penetrate far into the saint's personality, to realize the details of her wonderful career, to appreciate accurately her mental keenness, her splendid business talent, her quick wit, her affectionate disposition, her striking bravery. A sense of all this no doubt has coöperated with personal reverence and scholarly zeal in suggesting those painstaking careful researches, which in recent years have revealed so much that is new with regard to the text and the significance of Saint Teresa's Letters.

A complete enumeration of the various editions and translations of this work, while not without interest, would be rather to take us too far afield. Let us remind ourselves, however, that not until 1657 did the public receive the first Spanish edition—one painfully incomplete and containing but 65 letters. By 1748 such advance had been made that a French translation of 107 letters then appeared, and a little later, a more careful edition was made at Madrid, thanks to the labor of a committee of three appointed by the general of the

Discalced Carmelites in Spain. Until very recently the best known French translations have been the three volumes of Migne (1840-1845) and those of P. Bouix, S.J. (1861 and 1882). In 1900 appeared a new edition increased by some 70 new Letters and some 400 fragments never before published in French, due to the scholarly researches of Father Gregory of Saint Joseph, Discalced Carmelite.

As to the English translations, one containing seventy letters was put forth by Father Dalton of Northampton in 1853. For reasons unknown, it was never followed up by succeeding volumes as readers had been led to hope. This volume was re-edited in 1893 and again in 1902; its reimpression has suggested the present notice. The publication will be regarded with mingled feelings of satisfaction and annoyance by everyone familiar with the writings of Saint Teresa. The contents of the book of course, are full of charm, interest and endless inspiration, yet that this volume should be published in its present form is nothing less than an outrage upon our sense of propriety and a sad reflection upon our literary zeal. The plates appear to be new, some misprints at least have been rectified, and the book is sold cheaply—but beyond that, absolutely no consulting of public interest seems to have been attempted. In the edition of 1893 "Suarez" was written down "Saurez" and "Saurez" he still remains. By some unmistakable oversight the old edition repeated a letter first as No. VIII, and again as No. XXII—not even that easily discovered error has been rectified. There is not the slightest evidence of any use of recently acquired information. The publication before us certainly will effect good; our sincere wish is that its fruit may be multiplied a hundredfold: while it remains the only attainable edition of Saint Teresa's Letters, surely English-speaking Catholics cannot help feeling stung to shame.

ST. THOMAS' COLLEGE.

JOSEPH MCSORLEY.

**Poems of Ovid: Selections.** Edited by Charles W. Bain. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. xiv + 461.

The justification for adding this latest accession to the already rather numerous editions of Ovid is found, as the editor says "in the growing demand for some easier poetry than Vergil's in the earlier years of Latin reading. It has long been felt, indeed, that Vergil's syntax, vocabulary and scansion require a much surer knowledge, and consequently a longer acquaintance with the Latin tongue than the first years can possibly afford. Hence, if the courses in Latin poetry are to be orderly, that is progressive from the less

to the  
mind  
Ovid  
Their  
addit  
calcu  
the s

T  
school  
thous  
sand,  
comm  
editio  
punct  
caref  
dark  
ous i  
which  
words  
the r  
the s  
profit  
and  
group  
them.  
is of  
verba  
as rac  
occu  
sity a

TH  
class-  
tions  
and s  
"Rom

The  
CH  
in  
PP  
In  
Greek

to the more difficult, some reading, not quite beyond the young mind, must be substituted in the earlier years. Now the poems of Ovid, in the opinion of Mr. Bain, are the best preparation for Vergil. Their form and content are not beyond the beginner's grasp, and in addition the "Metamorphoses," filled with myth and fable, are well calculated to attract and hold the attention of the young, "and at the same time to clear the way for the more arduous work to come."

The volume under discussion is then, essentially, a preparatory school edition. It is made up of about four thousand verses, three thousand of which are carefully annotated, the remaining one thousand, intended for rapid reading, are also accompanied with a brief commentary. The text followed is that of A. Riese in his critical edition of 1889. The editor, Mr. Bain, claims the capitalization and punctuation as his own. In addition to the commentary, with its careful solution of grammatical problems and its lucid exposition of dark mythological lore, the volume is further enriched with numerous illustrations, a full vocabulary and a list of word-groups, from which list it is expected that the scholar will be enabled to retain the words most frequently occurring, because their rendition will be the result of his own intelligent effort. It seems, however, that the same end could be attained more easily and with quite as much profit by requiring the young student to commit to memory selected and interpreted passages. Language is not learned entirely by grouping together radically related words, and then memorizing them. The appreciation of word-collocation in the Latin sentence is of importance in determining with accuracy the meaning of its verbal constituents. Besides words are related syntactically as well as radically. And the memory of phrases and construction actually occurring will do much to dispel that very vagueness which of necessity attaches to radical elements.

That the volume is the result of considerable experience in the class-room is evident, both from the commentary and from the selections chosen. It cannot therefore but prove helpful to the teacher and scholar who have the pleasant task of reading the lines of "Rome's sweet sad singer."

JOHN D. MAGUIRE.

**The Teaching of Latin and Greek, in the Secondary School.** By Charles E. Bennett, A.B., and George P. Bristor, A.M., Professor in Cornell University. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1901. Pp. xvi + 330.

In the initial chapter of this welcome contribution to Latin and Greek pedagogics, Professor Bennett takes the following position:

Language is the supreme instrument of education; by language is meant the study of one's own language, which is achieved incomparably better by the indirect method of studying another language. In the present instance, this other language is Latin. Professor Bennett's analysis of the process of mental gymnastics through which the student of Latin must inevitably pass is thorough—all that could be desired. He quotes from President Eliot,<sup>1</sup> and then points out clearly and logically how the proper study of Latin contributes in an eminent degree to the four essential processes or operations of the educated mind: viz., "observing accurately; recording correctly; comparing, grouping, inferring justly; and expressing the result of these operations with clearness and force."

Professor Bennett is undoubtedly right in maintaining that "Training in the Vernacular" is the first and most important reason for studying Latin." This proposition is well substantiated by citing the testimony of Cicero, who declares in his "De Optimo genere oratorum" that he found careful translation from Greek into Latin a very useful exercise. His quotations from Lowell and Dettweiler are also apropos in confirmation of the above statement. Indeed, the great Cardinal Newman owed no small share of his command over the English language to his constant study of Cicero, of whom he could truly say as Dante said of Vergil, "My Master, thou, and guide."

Professor Bennett states his case clearly and his positive proofs are conclusive. His negative proofs, however, or his discussion of Latin *vs.* Modern Languages, will scarcely carry conviction. He gives two reasons for giving Latin a decided preference to either French or German. First the ideas and concepts of the Latin language are *remoter* from those of English than the ideas and concepts of the modern languages. This argument, if pushed to its logical conclusion, would lead to the substitution of Greek for Latin, and perhaps, of Sanskrit for either Greek or Latin. Remoteness of ideas and concepts is a rather weak plea in the question at issue. Besides, the statement, "all modern thought is essentially kindred," will hardly pass the pickets of accuracy. The second reason urged in favor of Latin as compared with the modern languages, is that Latin has supplied us with so large a share of our own vocabulary. These two reasons combined are slightly contradictory. Remoteness and contiguity generally exclude each other. His argument drawn from experience and his reply to Herbert Spencer, to Balin and to the less radical Frederick Paulsen, are decidedly stronger and more accurate than his two theoretical reasons for preferring Latin to French or

<sup>1</sup> "American Contributions to Civilization," p. 203 ff.

German as an instrument of secondary education. Professor Bennett criticizes what he styles the "Typical Beginner's Book of To-day."

The student's hard work is apparently lessened by these books, but as a result "pupils to-day are conspicuously inferior in the mastery of their inflections to the pupils of twenty-five years ago, as well as conspicuously inferior in their general familiarity with the Latin Grammar." The alleged overtraining of the memory has its sad consequences. In a chapter on Roman Pronunciation, Professor Bennett states the incontrovertible evidence for the same as taught at present in most of our American schools and colleges, and then strongly advocates its immediate removal. The experience of his last fifteen years in the class-room has led him to the conclusion that the Roman Pronunciation is a labyrinth of difficulties and yields no profit for the amount of time spent in its acquisition. His criticisms are not mere assertions; they do not end with the bitterness of the moment. Remedies are carefully pointed out and practical suggestions offered for the betterment of the situation. His plea for the return of Vergil's *Eclogues* to the class-room cannot fail to elicit the sympathy of every teacher who appreciates those consummate translations and imitations of the *Idyls* of Theocritus. Professor Bennett's reflections, suggestions and assertions on the subject under consideration are supported by years of experience. Young teachers will find an admirable guide in this contribution to modern pedagogics; and though many of the author's statements will not pass unchallenged, every teacher may glean a few useful hints from the "Teaching of Latin in the Secondary Schools."

J. J. TRAHEY.

HOLY CROSS COLLEGE.

**School Administration in Municipal Government.** By Frank Rollins, Ph.D. Vol. XI, No. 1, Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology and Education. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 106.

Within the brief pages of this brochure, the author points out many of the difficulties encountered by the village school in its rapid development into the municipal school system. Much of his information is derived from personal correspondence with "superintendents and other school officers in all the cities of the United States numbering more than one hundred inhabitants, and in an equal number of cities having a population of nearest to fifty thousand."

On the basis of this information, there is a brief treatment of such questions as *The Right and the Need of the State's Interference in the Control of the City School*; *The Necessity of Separating*



School Administration from other Departments of Municipal Government to the end that the School may be Wholly Removed from the Influence of Politics; Sources of Appointment; Qualifications and Tenure of Office of Members of the School Board, Superintendents, Principals, Teachers and Janitors. The author also calls attention to the need felt in every city of stimulating local interest in the school, and to the methods adopted in Brookline, Mass., St. Paul, Minn., and some other cities, to meet this need. Finally, the author discusses, briefly and on a purely theoretical basis, the peculiar advantages for social education offered by the schools of a great city.

It is to be regretted that the scope of Dr. Rollins' work did not permit him to address his questions to representative grade teachers in the various cities. The grade teachers' point of view on many of the questions at issue, is well worth considering. The recent work of the Chicago grade teachers in compelling the owners of municipal franchises to pay their taxes, and in securing initiative referendum legislation, is such a conspicuous illustration of the power of the grade teacher as a factor in social education as well as in municipal reform, that the absence of any mention of this work by Dr. Rollins will be regretted by many readers of his very instructive brochure.

THOMAS E. SHIELDS.

**Etudes Bibliques.** Par Alfred Loisy. Paris: Picard et Fils, 1901. 8°, pp. 160.

This little book—a second and enlarged edition—is important out of all proportion to its size. It is a generalization of the author's biblical studies, comprising the results of his labors, and a plea for their acceptance or at least for their toleration. It may be called M. Loisy's apology; better, the apology of the advanced school of French Catholic exegetes, of which the Abbé is the most distinguished and most outspoken representative. Courage, bordering on temerity, critical acumen and literary talent, have made the former professor of the Institut Catholique of Paris and the present instructor in Comparative Religion at the Sorbonne, a strong factor and storm-center in the present renaissance of critical theology in France.

M. Loisy is fortunate in his style. Being French, it is of course lucid. This language offers, in general, a cool, calm march of ideas, an exact harmony of thought and expression, and an absence of technicality and learned apparatus, which unite to make a model literary medium for the savant and critic, who wishes to make himself intelligible outside the circle of the initiated few. As much as



any living master of the language, M. Loisy has the rare and potent gift of clothing scientific thought in popular form.

It is well known that the Abbé Loisy is a keen critic, and at the same time one convinced that what is to many a revolutionary biblical criticism is nowise irreconcilable with Catholic faith, but on the contrary is a gain for the truth and a necessary arm for the successful defence of the written Word. Though a believer in the existence of "relative truths" in the Bible—a term which on its reverse side spells relative errors—M. Loisy holds that for Catholics to discuss the question of inerrancy from a purely theological point of view is irritating and inconclusive. He wishes the opposing schools to seek in Catholic criticism mutual reconciliation and a point of union against the forces of unbelief. He sagaciously remarks that while Catholic scholars are quarreling over the *crux* of biblical inerrancy, rationalism is making formidable assaults upon the authority of the Bible as a whole. "Il ne s'agit plus de savoir si la Bible contient des erreurs, mais bien de savoir ce que la Bible contient de vérité. 'Que vaut la Bible?' Telle est la question que l'exégèse non catholique fait retentir à nos oreilles par un si grand nombre de voix qu'il n'est plus en notre pouvoir de ne pas l'entendre. Nous devons opposer à la science rationaliste la science catholique de l'Écriture."

The fourth gospel is a favorite study of M. Loisy and it is the one in which he shows the greatest originality of mind. Yet he disclaims entire novelty here, as he finds in the attitude of Christian fathers and a few old expositors towards St. John's gospel and other Scriptures, at least the principles which he develops and applies so strikingly and sometimes with luminous effect. The question of authenticity is not directly treated; it has a secondary importance in the writer's eyes. The learned critic seems to still cherish some reserves on this point and is not an outspoken adherent of the traditional authorship. He is also rather non-committal on the delicate matters of the seeming variations between St. John and the synoptists, and the historicity of the former, though it is evident enough that he thinks that historical completeness and chronological order are subordinated to the evangelist's doctrinal purpose.

M. Loisy is least reserved and most satisfactory in his characterization of John's spirit and method. The gospel is symbolic and mystic. The evangelist's principle is that our Lord's actions and words are full of deep-lying meaning. He selects certain miracles and acts of the desired symbolic import and completes them by the Saviour's words. The words and deeds elucidate each other; but

the form of the discourse is St. John's, who in the course of years has re-conceived the Gospel of Jesus, and translates its symbols into a language and form which are drawn from his own mind and spiritual consciousness, while ever expressing the Gospel of Jesus. In other words, the fourth evangel is an inspired interpretation, whose terms were neither revealed nor dictated, but sprang spontaneously from the evangelist's thought, "qui est comme la conscience de l'église chrétienne." M. Loisy has closely studied this difficult but fascinating book. It seems to the reviewer that he has laid his finger upon the key to one of its greatest problems.

GEORGE J. REID.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

*Les Infiltrations Kantiennes et Protestantes et le Clergé Français, Etudes Complémentaires.* Par J. Fontaine, S.J. Paris: Retaux, 1902. 8°, pp. 437.

*Letters from a Self-Made Merchant to his Son.* Boston: Small, Maynard & Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 312.

*The Katipunan.* An illustrated historical and biographical study of the society which brought about the Insurrection of 1896-1898 and 1899, taken from Spanish State Documents; *The Katipunan or The Rise and Fall of the Filipino Commune* by Francis St. Clair. Manila: Tip. Amigos del Pais. Palacio 258, 1902. 16°, pp. 335.

*Vexata Quæstio, or what shall we do with the Friar?* A brief sketch of three Centuries of History in the Philippines. By W. Brecknock Watson. Manila: *ibid.*, 1901. 8°, pp. 44.

*A New Catechism of Christian Doctrine and Practice.* By Rt. Rev. James Belford, D.D. Notre Dame, Ind.: The Ave Maria, 1902. 8°, pp. 115.

*The Living Church and the Living God.* By Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J. New York: Benziger, 1902. 8°, pp. 32.

*The Wage of Gerald O'Rourke, Christmas Drama in three Acts.* Transposed by M. R. Thiele from a story by Francis J. Finn, S.J. New York: Benziger, 1902. 8°, pp. 47.

*Storia e Pregio dei Libri Corali Officiali, Studio del Sac. F. X. Haberl.* Rome: Pustet, 1902. 8°, pp. 69.

*L'Uso del Canto Gregoriano tradizionale, etc.* Rome: Pustet, 1902. 8°, pp. 43.

- The Accadians of Madawaska, Maine. By Rev. C. W. Collins. Boston: 1902. 8°, pp. 66. (N. E. Cath. Hist. Society Publications, no. 3.)
- Memorial of the Most Reverend Michael Augustine Corrigan, D.D., Third Archbishop of New York. Compiled and published by authority. New York: The Cathedral Library Association, 1902. 8°, pp. xii + 234.
- La Question Biblique chez les Catholiques de France au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siecle. Par Albert Houtin. 2d ed. Paris: Picard, 1902. 8°, pp. 378.
- Un peuple antique au pays de Ménélék: Les Galla (dits d'origine gauloise), Grande Nation Africaine. 2d edition. Par le R. P. Martial de Salviac. Paris: H. Oudin, 1902. 8°, pp. 353.
- Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christenthums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Von Ad. Harnack, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. 8°, pp. 561.
- Three Letters of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbôgh (485-519). Edited from Syriac Manuscripts in the Vatican Library. Rome: 1902. 8°, pp. 190. (Catholic University Dissertation.)
- Jean-Marie de La Mennais (1780-1860). Par le R. P. Laveille. Paris: Poussielque, 1903. 8°, pp. 551, 680.
- Julien l' Apostat. Vols. II-III. Par Paul Allard. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. 8°, pp. 376, 416.
- Santa Cecilia e la sua basilica nel Trastevere, Note di critica, del Sac. Dr. V. Bianchi-Cagliosi. Rome: Pustet, 1902. 8°, pp. 89.

## THE UNIVERSITY AND THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE.

On Thursday, December 8, feast of the Immaculate Conception, the Apostolic Delegate visited the University, and was welcomed by the entire body. He assisted at the Solemn Pontifical Mass sung by the Rt. Rev. Rector, and afterward imparted to all present the Papal Benediction. There were present at the dinner many distinguished guests, among them Mgr. Donatus Sbarretti, Apostolic Delegate to Canada, Very Rev. Mgr. F. Z. Rooker, secretary of the Delegation, and Rev. Dr. D. J. Stafford, of St. Patrick's Church. Toward the end of the banquet the Rt. Rev. Rector rose and extended to the Delegate a formal welcome to his new office:

**Address of the Rt. Rev. Rector.**—*Your Excellency:* We appreciate the great honor conferred upon the University by your willingness to visit it at the very opening of your career among us and to take part in the solemnities of our Patronal Feast. We are deeply sensible of the kindness which thus expresses your interest in the University, the work of which is so important and far-reaching. In union with all the Catholics of the United States we cordially welcome you as the Apostolic Delegate, the representative of the Holy See among us. In your appointment there appears a new proof of the solicitude of the Sovereign Pontiff for the welfare of the Church in our beloved country. It is a strengthening of the tie which binds us to the center of spiritual authority, and bids us feel anew that in the person of the Delegate we have the close watchfulness and tender care of the Father of the Faithful, whom the whole world loves. This University extends to your Excellency a special greeting with the fondness of a special affection. You are the representative of its founder Leo XIII. Anxious for the higher education of clergy and laity, immediately and lovingly responding to the earnest desire of the American Hierarchy, our illustrious Pontiff clothed this institution with the character of a Pontifical University, and its aims and purposes are set forth in its Pontifical Constitutions. It holds also a charter from the District of Columbia.

It  
made  
ship  
Apost  
care  
gate,  
advic  
dence  
tion o  
It  
Found  
heart,  
olie t  
ago is  
What  
ment.  
by the  
ties ha  
schola  
circles  
store  
once v  
fame  
all se  
the de  
them  
Me  
versity  
here  
minist  
A  
univer  
withst  
being  
fessors  
Th  
done,  
privat  
contri  
of this  
sity is  
passed

It was eminently proper that the hospitality of the University made it for a time the home of the first Delegate, when that friendship began which has always characterized the relations between the Apostolic Delegation and the University. Confided to the fostering care of the Bishops and under the kindly supervision of the Delegate, the University carries on its work successfully. It seeks his advice and relies on his guidance and counsel with the same confidence in which any Pontifical institution in Rome relies on the direction of the Holy Father.

Its one desire has been ever to realize the hopes of its illustrious Founder, never failing to respond to the best instincts of the Catholic heart, and unflinchingly faithful to the received traditions of Catholic truth. The mustard seed planted a little more than a decade ago is reaching forth into the trunk and branches of a mighty tree. What was then a waste of farm land is now a vast university settlement. Buildings, magnificent in their proportions, have been erected by the munificent generosity of our Catholic men and women; faculties have been established in which are found, as teachers, men whose scholarship is recognized in Catholic and non-Catholic academic circles, and whose writings are valuable contributions to the world's store of knowledge. Among them, too, are many young men who once were students in their departments, and who are now acquiring fame by their instructions and writings; priests and laymen from all sections of our country have followed the courses, seeking for the degrees which mark the higher scholarship, and which entitle them to the positions of trust now held by them in Church and State.

Many religious institutes appreciating the benefits of the University have placed their scholasticates in a cluster about it, and here have been trained many who fill with honor the places of administrators and teachers in their colleges.

A large body of influential teachers in New York has asked for university direction and instruction in work of pedagogy and, notwithstanding the exactions of university departments, this work is being done with credit and success under the direction of our professors in the great city of New York.

This is but an outline of what the University is doing, and has done, for the higher Christian education. All this means sacrifice, privations, generosity, unselfishness on the part of the men who have contributed their thought and energy to the educational upbuilding of this institution. Men sometimes fail to recognize that the University is in its youth, and that not much more than a dozen years have passed over its head; that like all new institutions it has had to prove

itself worthy of confidence; that it has had to enter into competition with long organized and well endowed universities. Notwithstanding all this the name of the Catholic University is one of honor and renown. The number of its students may be small when compared with collegiate institutions, yet it is well to remember that it is not a seminary nor a college, nor has it the attractions in many departments of professional or semi-professional instruction. Alone it stands in our country to-day as an institution doing graduate work without collegiate classes. To its credit be it said that its students form a very large proportion of Catholic graduates who, outside of professional schools, enter into the higher educational courses. Its numbers must necessarily be limited, yet while it seeks numbers, it is not to be condemned for the lack of numbers. It is to be judged by the scope of its work, as defined by those who interpret its pontifical Constitutions and its University aims and purposes, as well as by the conditions which surround the Catholic graduate body seeking the higher education outside of professionalism. With its limited equipment it has indeed done wonders. Give it the years of its associates, give it an endowment in keeping with its needs, and its record will be worthy of the Pontiff who laid its foundation.

With the full appreciation of the work that is being done by our Catholic colleges, the University has hitherto declined to enter the field of collegiate work. In consequence it has no large body of undergraduate students such as swell the registers of the older and richer American universities, nor can it have such while it remains faithful to its purely graduate character. A very small percentage of Catholic students is found in non-Catholic post-graduate institutions, but it must be remembered that many of these young men have pursued their undergraduate courses in these same institutions; that many others are there because the school is near their homes, while to some there is the attraction which comes from the social advantages which such schools are thought to possess.

It is difficult to conceive that a Catholic college should act as a feeder to non-Catholic universities, and yet, disguise it as we may, this must eventually be the case, unless there be developed here, under the auspices of the Church, a fully equipped university, in which the layman as well as the ecclesiastic shall find every facility for doing professional and scientific work. If we read the constitutions granted to it by the Sovereign Pontiff we cannot fail to recognize that such indeed is the scope of the Catholic University as planned and outlined in them. This motive is the source also of the generosity of the Catholic laity, who in the foundation of its professorships, had

in min  
as for  
sacred  
enterin  
Catholi  
trainin  
Catholi  
versity  
uphold  
that sh  
been th  
order t  
teacher  
power  
forgott  
not fol

This  
where  
make  
to mak  
manhod  
whole  
to all  
that w  
lectual  
out the  
to do  
reveale  
afraid  
for the  
done by  
one ser  
Church

It s  
our gre  
its eyes  
guides  
State.  
warnin  
confron  
teach a  
has nev



in mind the securing of a Catholic education for lay students as well as for clerics. And this becomes to the University one of its most sacred trusts. To dissuade those who seek the higher education from entering this University is to expose them to the danger of non-Catholic institutions, and thus neutralize the effect of that Christian training which is provided at untold cost in the parochial school and Catholic college. To diminish in any way the influence of the University upon the life of this great American people would be to uphold and confirm those who cast upon the Church the reproach that she is no longer the teacher of mankind, and that she has never been the sincere friend of science and progress. If Catholics, in order to learn anything outside of theology, must sit at the feet of teachers who do not share our Catholic beliefs, then the intellectual power of Catholicism will be weakened, then, indeed, will we have forgotten the admonition of Leo XIII, "Catholics should be leaders not followers."

This country needs a university center of Catholic thought, where religion and science in their highest forms may combine to make known the marvellous truth of God; where scholarship aims to make known and defend religion, and give glory to our common manhood. Its mission should be to wield a vivifying influence on the whole educational system, to unify and elevate it, as also to give tone to all Catholic institutions; to set a definite standard of scholarship that will arouse in clergy and laity a love for the highest intellectual attainments; to advance the interests of science and widen out the horizon of human knowledge, by producing men prepared to do the work of science under the inspiration and guidance of revealed truth; to show the world that the Catholic Church is not afraid of the truth wherever found, but on the contrary is eager for the largest possible measure of truth. Thank God, this has been done by the Catholic University. The University is, and will be, in one sense, an object lesson, showing the attitude of the Catholic Church to the highest development of the mind.

It stands in the Capital City of our nation, close to the heart of our great Republic, in touch with the currents of national life, with its eyes upon all the movements that stir society, and it shapes and guides the education of men destined to be leaders in Church and State. Its voice is heard above the din and bustle of commercialism, warning men that society can find no solution for the problems that confront it, unless it be sought in the light of Him who came to teach and to save. It is the proud boast of the University that it has never for a moment wavered in its loyalty to the principles of

Christian philosophy, which alone can answer the demands of reason and give solid foundation to all religious and social life. Loyal in every fibre to the Holy See, true to the noblest ideals of Christian scholarship, and devoted to the best interests of our American life, the Catholic University is doing the work of God among our people. We have faith in it, as a mission from God, we are full of hope in its future, that with fidelity to the aims and purposes of the great Leo, as the very center of the highest scholarship it will always be the honor of our Church and the pride of our Republic.

There is a special delight for us in welcoming your Excellency, because as a religious and a superior of religious, you have had years of successful experience in our country. We are not a little proud that while clothed with the highest authority of the Holy See among us, and exercising the fullest spiritual jurisdiction, you are also a citizen of our Republic and enjoy all its political privileges. Then, again, as the son of the great St. Francis, your learning and piety and gentleness commend you to all who know you. In our neighboring Canada your mission as Apostolic Delegate has called forth the kindest sentiments of respect and affection for your personal character. You have that traditional love of learning which has been the inspiration of so many scholars of your order who are indented with the universities of the world and rank as saints of God. You will find among our affiliated colleges, the college of your brethren, and among our students the members of your beloved order. I take it as a good omen that you are here on our Patronal Feast, sharing with us the glory and the graces of this day. We remember with gratification that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception found its foremost champions among the sons of St. Francis.

As Rector of the University, and in the name of its trustees, faculties, affiliated colleges, ecclesiastics, laymen, I welcome you among us as the Apostolic Delegate, the representative of Leo XIII, our illustrious Pontiff and beloved Father. We welcome you as the successor of delegates who by their learning, piety and kindly sympathy have won the deepest affection of our hearts. We offer to you this expression of our loyalty with an earnest prayer for your success in the important mission that has been entrusted to you by our Holy Father. We beg you to bear special watchfulness over all the interests of this University, and to be to it a father, a counsellor, and a friend. In return we pledge you our love and obedience.

After the applause which greeted the Rector's address the Most Rev. Delegate was enthusiastically received.

Rep  
thanks  
represe  
and stu

You  
Pontiff  
a source  
Catholi  
Holy F  
Univers  
they wi

Enc  
his wis  
the pro  
student  
their h  
put the

Att  
of trut  
to worl  
form th

How  
how cor  
to its r  
courage  
Father  
you ha  
Catholi  
religion  
them n  
also to

I kn  
overcon  
But as  
no dou  
will be

You  
Leo X  
founde  
has nev  
evident  
such a

**Reply of Mgr. Falconio.**—*Right Rev. Rector:* Accept my sincerest thanks for the cordial welcome you have been pleased to tender to the representative of the Holy See in the name of the trustees, professors and students of the Catholic University of America.

Your sentiments of attachment and gratitude towards the Supreme Pontiff for all that he has done for the welfare of this institution are a source of great consolation to me, and afford me the hope that the Catholics of America will appreciate the deep interest which the Holy Father has taken in promoting more and more, through this University, the higher culture of the youth of this republic, and that they will profit by it.

Encouraged by the Supreme Pastor of the Church, and acting upon his wise counsels, the superiors will know how to govern with success, the professors how to teach with soundness of principles, and the students how to treasure up with confidence in their minds and in their hearts the precious teachings of science and religion, and to put them in practice.

Attached as you are to the Supreme Pontiff, the infallible teacher of truth, I have no doubt that, under his guidance, you will be able to work with success, and that the blessings I have mentioned will form the happy inheritance of this institution.

However, it is well to remember that, no matter how holy and how commendable may be the object we have in view, in order to come to its realization we shall have to overcome difficulties and work with courage, earnestness and perseverance. The end which the Holy Father had in view in the canonical erection of this University, as you have observed, is noble and useful. It is intended to give to the Catholic youth of America an opportunity to receive a scientific and religious education in its highest form—an education apt to render them not only possessors of the treasures of science and religion, but also to place them in a position to impart these blessings to others.

I know that, in order to realize fully this object, you will have to overcome difficulties and work with earnestness and perseverance. But as earnestness and perseverance are the factors of success, I have no doubt that, in the course of time, this young Catholic Institution will be second to none of the most illustrious universities of the land.

You have just recalled our attention to what the immortal Pontiff, Leo XIII has done for the welfare of the University. He is its founder, its protector, its guiding genius. Since its foundation he has never ceased to give it encouragement and to offer you the most evident proofs of his benevolence. You may be justly proud of such a patron. However, permit me to observe that this benevolence

of the Sovereign Pontiff will not surprise you when you consider the noble and effective part he has always taken in whatsoever concerns the scientific, moral and religious movements of modern society. During his long pontificate he has always wished that the Church should be more than ever at the head of every real progress in science, in art, in Christian knowledge. Nothing has escaped his vast and profound intelligence. Fine arts and letters, science of government and international relations, have found in him a profound and clear expositor, and a protector full of energy and good taste. But the most ardent desire of his heart has been not merely to illuminate the intelligence; he has also wished to move and purify the heart by applying himself earnestly to the revival of Christian virtues amongst the people. Hence it is that we see him so highly esteemed and honored by all men of good will who recognize in him a superior genius, the glory of the papacy and of the two centuries to which he belongs.

Then it is this ardent love for all that is grand, for all that is beautiful, for all that is good, and, at the same time, his esteem for this republic, which have led him to give to your University his patronage and to watch over it with constant solicitude. May God grant that, under such efficacious protection, you may arrive at that apex of glory which the name of Catholic University implies!

You, Rt. Rev. Rector, have made allusion to the young Franciscans who frequent the schools of the University. May these young men profit by them, and may the spirit of their glorious ancestors, who gave luster to some of the most renowned universities of Europe, be transmitted in them for the greater glory of God and of the Church.

Besides the Franciscans I observe that some other religious congregations profit by your teaching. Their buildings form, as it were, a crown surrounding the University. Thus science and religion, even in its most rigid form, seem to combine together to make of these young men a body of valiant soldiers to fight the battles of the Lord in both fields. May they emulate in virtue and in learning those bands of missionaries who from the earliest date of the discovery of America, at the cost of long and patient labor, laid the first germs of Christian civilization and high culture, which, in the course of time, fertilized by the zeal of their successors and of the secular clergy, have brought forth their fruit in that high civilization which places the American people on a level with the most advanced nations of the world!

This fraternal union of the secular and religious clergy of the United States in partaking of the benefits of an institution destined

for th  
of the  
Ap  
the st  
toward

In  
McMa  
gather  
bers o  
tors a  
of ma  
promi  
entire  
impre  
this e  
repres

for the highest intellectual development speaks well for the future of the University and of the Church in America.

Again I pray the Rt. Rev. Rector, the trustees, the faculties and the students to accept my best thanks for their sentiments of loyalty toward the Holy See, and best wishes for success.

In the afternoon was held a reception. The assembly room in McMahon Hall was crowded from four to six. A more brilliant gathering has never met within our walls. There were present members of the diplomatic corps, members of the administration, senators and representative of the United States, presidents and officials of many institutions of learning, and a large gathering of the more prominent residents of the city. The weather was faultless, and the entire proceedings of the day were calculated to leave an excellent impression on all who assisted at them. It is sincerely hoped that this event is a good omen for the career among us of the official representative of the Holy See.

---

## THOMAS JOSEPH BOUQUILLON.

By the death of our Professor of Moral Sciences the University loses an original member of its staff of teachers, one who was identified with all its interests, a part of all its history, a principal factor in its growth, since the day when its doors were first opened to the studious Catholic youth of the United States.

Dr. Bouquillon was a typical Catholic theologian—for those who know what such words imply no more honorable praise is possible. To a minute acquaintance with the entire subject-matter of philosophy and theology, such as befits every well-bred priest, he added a knowledge of their literary history, such as is possessed by very few. Indeed, we may say at once that Catholicism is so much poorer by the loss of a genuine encyclopædic mind, one of that class of ecclesiastical savants who belong less to our own uncertain and disturbed days than to the calm academic world of cloister and library in the pre-revolutionary time. He grew up in an atmosphere of learning; books were his one concern in life, their content his study, their spirit his spirit, and their ideals his own. He had all the qualities of an eminent theologian—sincere and holy love of truth, thoroughness of investigation, order and method in his procedure, a dialectic at once sure and honest, an exposition clear and logical. If somewhat wanting in color and movement, he was never loose or confused. His memory was justly held to be prodigious; it threw its tentacles over all that came within his purview as one day possibly useful in any of his many lines of study. It was at once quick, tenacious, responsive. He was a walking “nomenclator” of all the modern theologians, beginning with the upcoming of the scholastics; more than once have his colleagues been amused and edified to see him complain, with chapter and verse, of the imperfections of great classical works of reference that seemed,



like seines, to have let nothing escape their exhaustive sweep. He was especially at home in all that pertained to the writings of Catholic theologians of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, notably those of Spain and the Low Countries, whom he ever held in the highest esteem. His library held their best works and his students will remember with what delight he would wander from one old folio to another, building up slowly and persistently out of their treasures the doctrine he had to expound. Yet, he was not wont to swear "in verba magistri"; his mind was peculiarly self-contained and independent, one in which the judgment primed all the other faculties, leaving it apparently, at times, rather too cold and logical, the victim of its own insight and grasp.

As long as it endures, the University will owe his memory a debt of gratitude, for it was he who really laid its academic foundations. By age and service he was the principal among the little group of men called to begin in the United States the long slow work of the creation of a Catholic University amid circumstances that neither they, nor men wiser than they, quite thoroughly understood or mastered. He brought to the task, besides ardor and conviction, a wide knowledge of the pedagogical life of the older universities of Europe, their academic rights, privileges, spirit; also, their duties and responsibilities. He was deeply conscious of the dignity and the splendor of the academic office; whatever enhanced it or illustrated it was welcome to him; any blot or stain or degradation was to him as personal hurt or wrong. One might say that his commonwealth was the "Universitas Studiorum"; he wanted no better citizenship, no sweeter companionship, no honors or victories that it could not approve. Though our country and our language were new to him, his own democratic convictions and temper fitted him to coöperate in mapping out the general lines of development for the schools contemplated in the first stadium of the University's life. In this work he aided by counsel and study, by personal service at all times, by suggestions and corrections; in a word, he was never wanting in those earliest years, whatever were the task laid before him. In the University Senate he was always heard with profit. Somewhat

slow and hesitating in speech, he usually went at once to the core of the question or the kernel of the difficulty. His counsel was ever calm, dignified, conservative.

The Faculty of Theology always cherished him as its most learned member. Its curriculum of studies is particularly his work, and to the end he followed every new problem with an interest that never abated. In the Faculty meetings, in committee sessions, in familiar intercourse, the progress of ecclesiastical studies was his constant theme. His large conspectus over the theological arena of the past and present permitted him to speak with particular authority on most matters pertaining to the ecclesiastical sciences. Withal, he was modest and unassuming, and though he was at times tenacious in his views, he was always courteous and mild in his relations with his fellow professors.

Dr. Bouquillon possessed an innate gift for teaching. His real chair was not in the more or less formal work of the lecture-room, but in his "Seminar" or Academy. In this bi-weekly meeting of his students, and in the Journal Club or meeting for discussion of new books and review articles, each familiar and voluntary in its character, came out all the qualities of a mind peculiarly fitted to develop other minds—earnestness and devotion in research, patience and perseverance in the best methods, openness to all suggestions and indications, a large and correct view of the phases, relations, points of contact, shadings of the question at issue. Not a few young priests in all parts of our country owe to him the acquisition of a new sense—the historico-theological sense. The history of a question or problem was ever his first concern; what was its genesis, and how did other students handle it from the time it took shape and meaning? He was, therefore, easily eminent in bibliography, not only in that of his own beloved subject—the moral sciences—but in the particular bibliography of all the ecclesiastical sciences, as far as they bore on his own studies. It would not be too much to say that very few printed books of any importance to the theological sciences were unknown to him.

The Library of the Faculty of Theology was planned by him, set in order, and to his death administered with loving

fideli  
no m  
ably  
both  
was  
lioph  
the  
scien  
them  
the s  
I  
those  
of th  
cons  
and  
The  
cative  
altru  
TH  
easi  
so m  
of h  
will  
I  
thir  
that  
his  
dom  
sch  
ther  
Lou  
he  
amp  
hab  
I  
a lo  
und  
own  
mor

fidelity and discriminating judgment. Its 30,000 volumes are no mean tribute to his taste and good sense, for it fits in admirably to the numerous other smaller libraries of the University, both public and private. To see it grow in riches and utility was his most sincere joy, for Dr. Bouquillon was a "bibliophile" of the first rank. His work-tables, ever covered with the newest and choicest literature of the moral and social sciences, drawn from every quarter, friendly and hostile, were themselves like bright hearth-stones, filling with a warm zeal the souls of his students and visitors.

Indeed, he was constantly besieged for help, not only by those of his own household, but by outsiders. In every rank of the clergy he had numerous correspondents; his *mémoires*, consultations, decisions, and other literary work, nameless now and intangible, are scattered far and wide between the oceans. The growing weakness of his health made him less communicative towards the end, but did not destroy the root of scholarly altruism that was a part of himself.

The Editors of *THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN* may not easily forget the wise and gentle scholar whose pen illustrates so many of its volumes, whose counsel was ever at the disposal of his colleagues, and whose pure academic spirit, it is hoped, will forever dwell with all the University publications.

Bouquillon was a very great theologian, by no means in the third rank, and the University has reason to congratulate itself, that his name is written first on the roll of its teachers. With his learning there came to us no little of the temper, the wisdom, the life-experience of the great Catholic theological schools of Europe. We shall always feel that through him there has been no break of continuity between Paris, Oxford, Louvain and Washington. As became a Roman student, he was devoted to the Roman Church. His writings give ample proof of this attachment which his teaching and habitual discourse emphasized.

He was an upright man, a pious priest, a faithful friend, a loyal churchman, patient and forgiving when assailed or misunderstood, a man of infinite sympathy with the world of his own time, truly a consulting physician of its social woes and moral ailments. Somewhat solitary and reserved in manner,

sedate and introspective, he lacked only a certain flow of imagination, a certain temperament of publicist, to make his name and his learning household words throughout the Catholic world. In return, he was a teacher of teachers, and his influence will forever be felt in the Church and in the land of his adoption. His numerous students will surely remember him at the holy altar; we may even hope that there will arise in their ranks some at least of our distinguished teachers of the future.

*Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor.*

He was an apostle of the Higher Education of the Catholic Priesthood. It was in their service that he lived and toiled. And now that he is no more, may his example long shine before all who once sat at his feet, to bring forth similar fruits of virtue and learning! *Requiescat in pace!*

---

ME

T  
D.D.,  
press  
bisho  
oppo  
of th  
and l  
was  
their  
with  
and  
Card  
him  
were  
Phila  
Chris  
of N  
and  
Eccle  
Rect  
Desh  
Zahn  
Fr. S  
Univ  
Brot  
Chri  
but,  
Dr. M  
S  
Rev.  
being  
deac  
Rev.  
San  
of th  
class

## MEMORIAL EXERCISES FOR DR. BOUQUILLON.

The Memorial exercises for Very Rev. Thomas Bouquillon, D.D., late Professor of Moral Theology, were of a most impressive character. The presence of the Cardinal, the Archbishops and Bishops at the meetings at the University gave an opportunity for very marked tribute on their part to the memory of the professor and the universally recognized, much beloved and highly respected scholar. The occasion at the University was an academic one, the rector and professors appearing in their academic robes. The chapel was filled to its capacity with the visitors, the professors and students of the University, and the superiors and students of the affiliated colleges. Cardinal Gibbons occupied a place in the sanctuary, and beside him was the Rector of the University. Among those present were Most Rev. Archbishops Williams, of Boston; Ryan, of Philadelphia; Elder of Cincinnati; Ireland, of St. Paul; Christie, of Portland, Oregon; Keane, of Dubuque, and Farley, of New York; Right Rev. Bishops Maes, of Covington, Ky., and O'Gorman, of Sioux Falls, S. D., Professor Emeritus of Ecclesiastical History at the University; Monsignor Kennedy, Rector of the American College, Rome, Italy; Very Rev. Father Deshon, C.S.P., Provincial of the Paulists; Very Rev. Dr. Zahm, C.S.C., Provincial of the Holy Cross Congregation; Rev. Fr. Shandelle, S.J.; Rev. F. X. Mulvaney, S.J., Georgetown University; Rev. F. X. McCarthy, S.J., Gonzaga College; Brother Gordian, Visitor of the Baltimore Province of the Christian Brothers Colleges; Rev. Paul Griffith, Rev. Fr. Hurlbut, of Clarksville, Md.; Rev. Fr. Tower, of Hyattsville, Md.; Dr. Mallon, the attending physician of Dr. Bouquillon.

Solemn Pontifical Mass of Requiem was celebrated by Right Rev. Bishop Maes, Rev. John Webster Melody, of Chicago, being the assistant priest; Rev. Joseph McSorley, C.S.P., deacon; Rev. Maurice J. O'Connor, of Boston, sub-deacon; Rev. Romanus Butin, S.M., and Rev. Thomas P. Heverin, of San Francisco, being masters of ceremonies. All the officers of the mass were among the older students of Dr. Bouquillon's classes.

At the conclusion of the Mass Rev. William J. Kerby, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Sociology, a former pupil of Dr. Bouquillon, delivered the eulogy.

DISCOURSE OF REV. DR. KERBY.

Thomas Bouquillon, Priest, Doctor of Theology, Professor of Moral Theology in the University since 1889, is dead. We are summoned by the University to attend this solemn ceremony in memory of him, and to offer public prayer for the happy repose of his soul. Denied the melancholy comfort of seeing and serving him in his last moments, we can in our quiet grieving only picture the freshly made grave in distant Belgium while we here ask God to give him rest.

One would rather weep alone, and think in silence over the life and character of this calm kindly man, but the University, obeying the impulse that springs from gratitude and love, must pay public tribute to him who was its pride and glory. Great as is the loss which his death inflicts, it were far greater did his name and memory perish from our traditions. May this solemn service fix both name and memory in these traditions forever!

Thomas Bouquillon was born at Warneton in Belgium, May 16, 1842. He studied philosophy and theology at Roulers and Bruges. He was ordained in Rome in 1865. He entered the Gregorian University and was made Doctor of Theology in 1867. In the same year he was appointed Professor of Moral Theology in the Seminary of Bruges. In 1877 he was appointed to the Catholic University of Lille, France; in 1889, he came to this University as Professor of Moral Theology, and taught here till the close of the past year. His health began to fail some time ago. He went to Europe in June of the present year; failing rapidly, he was unable to return, and he died last Thursday.

He published the following works: "*Theologia Moralis Fundamental*," the third edition of which is now issuing from the press; "*De Virtutibus Theologicis*," in one volume and "*De Virtute Religionis*," in two volumes. He had completed, but not published, three volumes "*De Justitia et Jure*"; "*De Eucharistia*"; "*De Pœnitentia*." He edited and enriched with critical and historical notes the following: "*De Magnitudine Ecclesiæ Romanæ*," of Thomas Stapleton; "*Leonis XIII. Allocutiones, Epistolæ, Aliaque Acta*," the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, the *Dies Sacerdotalis* of Direkink"; "*l'Excellence de la Sainte Eucharistie* of Luis de Grenada." He published upwards of fifty articles, pamphlets, critical, theological, historical.



The simple mention of these facts conveys no just impression of the merit, activity and power of our departed colleague. His was a life so filled with usefulness that one can with difficulty estimate it, and that difficulty is increased when affection and gratitude bid one be loving rather than analytical or exact.

Strange it is and wonderful that life should be such a mystery, baffling, fascinating, evasive; attracting us to study it, and disappointing us by the failure which we meet; understood, yet never thoroughly so; varied and inconstant as the play of sunbeams on the floating clouds, yet stable and identical as the very mountain. Philosophy has not defined it, nor thinking explained it, nor investigation revealed its secrets. And hence when one is taken from us—one who stood alone in attainments of mind and heart—strange insistent questions arise within us and demand reply. "What is life, what its meaning, what is noblest, highest; what deep truths should we learn from it and how shall we read them?" We seek for answer, but tears blind, they do not sharpen vision. We would remain silent in contemplation of our loss—as we might were we to see a stately ship laden with rarest treasure from many lands engulfed and lost forever. Like a stately ship, this mind that death has taken was richly stored with treasures of knowledge, understanding, and wisdom from many lands. It is lost to us now, except in memory. Well may we to-day study that life—so simple, so humble, so strong, so useful, true, and seek to learn the lessons of virtue in which it so abounded.

Thomas Bouquillon was in manner simple, gentle, courteous, sympathetic, kind, marked by sincerity and directness. In disposition unselfish and helpful, he was far more pleased in serving others than in being served. Optimistic, invariably cheerful, hopeful, his influence was always constructive, and his example an inspiration. Gifted with rare mental power, he lacked aggressiveness and ostentation, delighting rather in the retirement and silence of his beloved library. In conversation and in counsel last to speak and wisest when speaking, his self-repression was no less rare than it was admirable. No one ever heard him boast of what he had done or could do; his personality seemed lost in his learning. Well may we say of him as he said of his Master Aquinas: "*Nihil habuit de se ipso.*" He lived on his admirations and not on his dislikes; he was charitable, tolerant of view and of personality, never volunteering an unfriendly remark or an unnecessary criticism. Again, as he said of St. Thomas we may say of him: "*Nihil habuit contra alios.*" Reverent, affectionate, deeply religious, one would think that he was writing himself into his book when he enumerated in his "Fundamental Theology" the qualities of the theologian, *fides viva, magna reverentia, perfecta sinceritas, ardens veritatis amor, libertas a præju-*

*dictis gentis, instituti, scholæ, ordinis.* The sweet serenity of his scholarly, priestly life, which rested on sure foundations, was never disturbed by the misrepresentations of trifling critics who served party and not truth, nor by the forgetfulness of those whom he had served, nor by the misunderstanding of those who had neither mind nor will to know the magnitude of his scholarship, the unselfishness of his work, and the simple, honest motives that dominated his life.

Nothing tempted him away from the pursuit of learning. Wise enough to know the values and relations of life according to which books are kept for eternity, he lived always in close touch with great men in church and state without seeking, loving or using the power that position brings.

In making for the moment a first estimate of Thomas Bouquillon, one feels that one may apply to him without irreverence St. Paul's description of charity. For like it, he was patient, kind; he envied not nor dealt perversely, was not puffed up; was not ambitious; sought not his own; was not provoked to anger; thought no evil. Rejoiced not in iniquity, but rejoiced with the truth; bore all things, believed all things, endured all things.

Of his learning, only one equally gifted could adequately speak. Blessed with a mind of rare and varied power, he brought to it a diligence, a consecutive methodical habit of study, that made him little less than a prodigy. He had a vast knowledge of facts, saw principles clearly, coördinated them accurately and based his interpretations on solid foundations. Careful in his mental processes, his convictions, opinions, views were as free from the influence of feeling, interest and preference as it is possible to imagine. His great knowledge was always at his service, within the call of consciousness. His views were therefore thorough, broad and safe. When analyzed, they were found to have been so carefully made that one thought of the many colors that the prism reveals in the ray of sunlight. History, philosophy, psychology, theology, science—all had converged into the beam of light that came from his splendid mind. He was Emerson's "All-reconciling thinker." We may aptly apply to our departed colleague the keen words of Silvius, who said of St. Thomas: "*Quattuor implacabiliter inter se pugnancia, brevis cum multitudine, multitudo cum securitate, securitas cum facilitate, facilitas cum brevitate, indissolubili pacis fœdere copulata, hic inveniuntur.*"

Thus objective and critical, thus synthetic, erudite and honest, thus diligent, he could not have been other than an extraordinary man.

His knowledge of the literary sources of his beloved science—moral theology—was coextensive with the sources themselves. His grasp of its principles was profound, his exposition luminous, erudite, balanced. He lifted the science high over the plane of casuistry,

placed  
to it d  
ipsum  
nobilis  
scienti

Re  
was no  
of thou  
the tru  
ing co  
ginnin  
gible y  
human

man.  
as a c  
histori  
and p  
mind.  
his ow  
thority  
tionally

He  
duty, g  
ulating  
lectures  
frequen  
colleagu  
from c  
his lea  
questio  
high an  
generou  
"Adfu  
tribus

Lea  
welfare  
though  
one to  
how it  
a great  
he was  
of our

In  
him ne  
other t

placed it on the higher levels of principle and philosophy, giving to it dignity and system. Again, as he said of St. Thomas: "*Apud ipsum moralis theologia toto suo nitore resplendens sua gravitate nobilis, objecti amplitudine immensa, apparet prout vere est, omnium scientiarum practicarum domina ac regina.*"

Remarkable for the accuracy of his theological sense, his mind was none the less historical. His keen understanding of movements of thought and life as well as his wide knowledge about them, revealed the true historical sense—the power to see and measure the converging complex processes which produce institutions; to discover beginnings, trace relations, see developments, and analyze the intangible yet powerful influences that combine to make movements in human society. This power alone might have made him a marked man. Reading history as a master theologian, and reading theology as a critical historian, his appreciation of the supernatural, as an historical fact as well as a theoretical truth, was remarkably accurate and profound. This was possibly the highest achievement of his mind. He possessed a knowledge of the sciences closely related to his own which was almost extensive enough to give his opinion authority, while his acquaintance with more remote fields was exceptionally wide.

He was thoroughly devoted to his students, exact in doing his duty, generous of time and energy beyond that and tireless in stimulating thought; patient and always hopeful of success. From his lectures and his students, from the revision of his books, he turned frequently, and always gladly, to assist, direct or advise a younger colleague in the university, from him to some scholar or student from other quarters who, perhaps, not sharing his faith, admired his learning and sought his aid; from such he turned to problems, questions, requests for information, assistance, sent to him by men high and low in church and state. With all he was gracious, ready, generous; so that we must again say of him as he said of St. Thomas: "*Adfuit principibus in consilium, pontificibus in adiutorium, fratribus in defensionem.*"

Learned in the history of universities, he was consecrated to the welfare of our own. Never shirking the dull routine of committee, though his heart would have kept him among his books, he was not one to minimize the duties of any office that came to him, no matter how it distracted him from intellectual work. He was consequently a great constructive force in our academic life by his activity, as he was an inspiration by his attainments—a splendid realization of our high ideal.

In all of these varied and exacting demands no one ever found him nervous, heard him complain of overwork, or knew him to be other than genial, helpful, scholarly, retiring and kind.

This hurried enumeration of some of the traits of mind, heart and manner of Thomas Bouquillon is complete enough to allow us to draw many useful lessons from his life. He taught us that highest scholarship is consistent with reverent, abiding religious faith; that power may be quiet and unobtrusive without failing of its possibilities; that simplicity, gentleness and charity—calm, enduring charity—are worthy adornments of any scholar; that a life free from all vile ambition for temporal glory and from self-seeking may contain within itself sources of endless peace, serenity and joy; that true learning spiritualizes, ennobles, sanctifies life. How well his life illustrates the words of St. James: "*Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you, let him show by a good conversation his work in the meekness of wisdom. . . . But the wisdom that is from above, first indeed is chaste, then peaceable, modest, easy to be persuaded, consenting to the good, full of mercy and good fruits, without judging, without dissimulation.*"

Any life that taught this much were a rare benediction indeed, but we have not yet discovered the secret of this life, no more than would the enumeration of the parts of a delicate and complex piece of mechanism tell us what was its function. The life, the work, of Thomas Bouquillon was one great solemn act of consecration to the Church of Christ as an historical institution. Understand that and you understand him; miss that and you miss the law, the glory and the inspiration of his life and mind. I speak not of his personal faith as a Catholic priest, nor of the tender piety that inspired his beautiful commentary on the mysteries of the Rosary, or brought him every day to visit Christ in the Blessed Sacrament on his way to the lecture room. These were, perhaps, not altogether distinctive. I refer to his unwavering, generous loyalty to the Church as an organization: to the remarkable degree in which he understood the genius of her institutions, absorbed her spirit, shared her point of view, believed, approved, defended, expressed it, honestly, bravely and well.

Our minds sometimes play subtle tricks on us. While we revere the authority, doctrine and definitions of the Church in the abstract, we may fail to do so equally in the concrete; while Church authority as a proposition receives complete submission, Church authority as a fact, perhaps, may not; while in theory we are Catholic in a general sense, in fact we at times become partisan. Witness the history of disorders in the Church or the recent history of France and Germany. Unlike all such and safe from any similar mistake was Thomas Bouquillon. His loyalty, devotion, love; his thought, his energy, were consecrated to the concrete Church: to the persons in whom the providence of God has vested authority; to the Church entire; to no party, view or school other than that of the Church itself.

Th  
carnat  
the In  
set sta  
theolog  
moral  
sense i  
than a  
Father  
theolog  
accura  
things  
false b  
and in  
perman  
natura  
reverer  
in the  
limitat  
relucta  
on the  
it migh  
place  
ment v  
and in  
qualiti  
around  
and th  
this all  
be men  
be prai  
It i  
duced  
olic tra  
how fa  
too dif  
ments  
The  
the ear  
honore  
And  
was th  
in thy

The great, luminous, central fact of history was to him the Incarnation: the great permanent and pervading fact of history since the Incarnation was the Church; the great fundamental science, which set standards, corrected criteria and systematized knowledge, was theology, "*Domina ac regina scientiarum*." Dogmatic theology, moral theology, canon law, Church history, were in a particular sense in his mind one. His objective views permitted nothing more than a distinction between abstract and concrete. He had read the Fathers with sympathy that gave him understanding; he had read theologians and philosophers with acumen; he knew modern thought accurately. Ever objective, truth seeking, truth loving, ancient things were to him not true because old, nor were modern things false because new. Throughout all the variations of thought, of life and institution which mark the centuries he saw his Church—permanent, enduring, divine. His mind understood well the supernatural; the Church was its organized expression. And all of the reverence, love, devotion, power of his being were consecrated to God in the service of his Church. The Church was his *pia mater*. Its limitations he saw much as a devoted child sees a fault in a parent—reluctantly, though honestly. His devotion to the university rested on the view that it was an organ of the Church, that in it and through it might be worked out safely processes of thought that would help to place theology and philosophy in safe and harmonious adjustment with what was right, true and enduring in modern thought and institutions. Hence also his love of learning, his industry, his qualities of mind and heart. Gather them all together, arrange them around this central complete consecration to the historical Church, and the life of Thomas Bouquillon is understood. For this all, from this all, to this all. Therefore, it is not unbecoming that his name be mentioned from this altar or that his personality and his learning be praised to-day.

It is unnecessary to attempt to study the influences which produced him. How far nature, how far grace, how far the sturdy Catholic traditions of his native Belgium, strengthened by his life in Rome, how far his absorbing devotion to St. Thomas, contributed—it were too difficult to say. Nor need we say. His character, his achievements are before us; our duty is to remember, to revere, to imitate.

Then rest, gentle, kindly spirit, rest in the bosom of God! May the earth press lightly on thy mortal remains; may thy grave be honored! Be thy memory a benediction forever!

And thou, O University, center of our hopes, forget not him who was thy pride and glory! He watched and loved and served thee in thy first days—do thou love and bless him even unto thy last!



---

## VERY REV. DR. MAGNIEN.

The death of Doctor Magnien on December 21, 1902, is a matter of sincere regret not only to his immediate colleagues in St. Mary's Seminary, but also to the Church in the United States. As head of an institution which has trained so many of the American clergy, he displayed those qualities of mind and heart which enlist the sympathy of the student and secure the esteem of the priest. Practical insight into the needs of the Church, breadth of view, tact in dealing with characters and situations, prudence in counsel and unfailing kindness, were his distinguishing traits. To these in large measure is due his success in the administration of the Seminary which holds so prominent a place in the work of clerical training.

In all the larger problems of education he was deeply interested. From its inception, the work of the University appealed to him strongly; and he was ever ready to further it by suggestions and advice based on his long experience. For its professors he had always that cordial welcome which is prompted by community of high purpose and by the genuine spirit of coöperation. Beyond the difficulties of the beginning, he saw the ideal and strove as best he could for its realization.

The director of a theological Seminary is called to bear responsibilities and to discharge duties which are of vital importance to religion, but which are not generally understood by the world at large. It is all the more needful that he should be both a man of character and a model to those who are preparing for the priesthood. St. Sulpice has produced many directors of this type. Doctor Magnien's life was a true expression of the Sulpitian spirit. He was an exemplary priest.

---



## NOTES AND COMMENT.

**The Encyclicals of Leo XIII.**—(Leon XIII d'après ses Encycliques, Jean d'Arras. Paris: Poussielgue, 1902. 8°, pp. 273.) The author classifies the teachings of the Pope under the following headings: The Church and Truth, Religious Unity, The Church and the Civil Power, The Training of the Priesthood, Freemasonry, The Organization of the Family, Social and Economic Questions, Political Duties of Catholics, Christian Piety and Devotion. When one has read it through it is clear with what success the Holy Father has made known the teachings of Catholicism on all these points.

**The Holy Shroud of Turin.**—The newest phase of the question of the authenticity of the Holy Shroud (il Santo Sudario) of Turin has given rise to more than 3,000 brochures, reviews and newspaper articles. In "Le Saint Suaire de Turin": Histoire d'une Rélique (Paris, Picard, 1902, 8vo, pp. 19) are resumed the historical proofs of its non-authenticity due to the pen of Canon Ulysse Chevalier. They have been fortunate enough to receive the adhesion of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, of M. Léopold Delisle, and of the Bollandists—certainly an uncommon assurance of correctness. In "Le Saint Suaire de Turin photographié à l'envers" (Paris, Picard, 1902, 8vo, pp. 13) M. Hippolyte Chopin maintains that the famous photographs of MM. Secondo Pia and P. Sanna Solaro are made not from the right or front side of the "Sudario" but from the reverse, the original painting having been covered and repaired in 1534 with very fine "toile de Hollande" by the Clarisses of Chambéry. "J'ai donc droit," says M. Chopin (p. 13) "de déclarer aujourd'hui que toute discussion basée sur la photographie de M. Pia ne peut être que stérile, parceque le document est faussé, et qu'il ne peut servir qu'à faire repandre bien inutilement des torrents d'encre et des avalanches d'articles, tant qu'on n'aura pas examiné l'original du *bon côté*."

**Critical Bibliography.**—MM. Alphonse Picard et fils (82, Rue Bonaparte, Paris) have inaugurated a "Bibliothèque de Bibliographies Critiques" to be edited by the "Société des Etudes Historiques" of which the bibliographer M. Henri Stein is president, and M. Funck-Brentano vice-president. These bibliographies aim at being exhaustive in the departments of general, provincial, and municipal history; the history of institutions, manners, customs, arts;

the history of literature; in biography, geography and the economic and social sciences. Some seventeen have already appeared and over a hundred more are announced. We have before us those on "Latin Epigraphy," by M. Cagnat; "Hoffman," by Henri de Curzon; "Les Conflits entre la France et l'Empire pendant le Moyen Age," by A. Leroux, and "Taine," by Victor Giraud. Very brief notes often accompany the book or article cited. The story of the long conflict between the Holy Roman Empire and the Crown of France is here outlined in the titles of 363 books and articles; the life and writings of Taine in 292. In the latter (p. 75, no. 262) Lorensbury should read "Lounsbury." These bibliographies are excellent, cheap, and highly serviceable, not only each one in itself, but as a collection. In the latter form they will render mutual service of cross-reference and completeness. Every working-library and "academy" of history should subscribe to the series.

**The First Universities.**—The origins of the universities of Paris and Bologna (Polleunis and Ceuterick, Louvain, 1902, 8vo, pp. 23) furnish the text of a pleasing and instructive discourse delivered by Dr. Cauchie, Professor of Church History in the University of Louvain, at the annual reunion of the alumni of the Séminaire de Bonne Espérance (September 19, 1901). The documents of Denifle-Chate-lain, and the synthetic work of Rashdall, furnish the basis and outlines of the description. But it is carried out with all the additional learning and the gifts of style and exposition that the historical world to-day recognizes in the able successor of Dr. Jungmann. Dr. Cauchie is one of those who have infused new life into the venerable schools of Louvain.

**Edward Bruce and Ireland.**—The original sources of Irish history for the early part of the fourteenth century have been carefully examined by Miss Caroline Colvin for her doctorate thesis in history before the University of Pennsylvania. The study is entitled "The Invasion of Ireland by Edward Bruce, 1315-1318" (Philadelphia, 1901) and is made at first hand from the contemporary annals, chronicles, histories, as well as from the modern collections of documentary material of the period. It is high time that the neglected history of Ireland be treated after the scientific and objective manner of this treatise. But this will not be until academic historical formation is more common among its students and narrators. And that will not happen until a truly national government sits at Dublin, and inaugurates for this ancient folk what Stein did for Prussia, a "*Monumenta Hiberniæ Historica*" with all that such an enterprise means.

**The Philippine Islands, 1493-1803.**—The Arthur H. Clark Company, Cleveland, O., announce in a limited edition, an extensive, and unusually important literary undertaking—an historical series entitled "The Philippine Islands, 1493-1803: Explorations by early Navigators, descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History, and records of the Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous books and manuscripts, showing the political, economic, commercial, and religious conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the beginning of the nineteenth century," in fifty-five volumes, the first of which will appear about January 15, 1903. This work will present (mainly in English translation) the most important printed works, to the year 1803, including a great number of heretofore unpublished MSS., which have been gathered from various foreign archives and libraries, principally from Spain, Portugal, France, England, Italy, Mexico, Japan, the Philippines, etc. The manuscripts which have been known to a very few scholars only, and have been very difficult heretofore to study, are of great importance at the present time.

The series will be edited and annotated by Miss Emma Helen Blair, A.M., of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, assistant editor of "The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents," and James Alexander Robertson, Ph.B., also formerly engaged upon that work. An historical introduction and notes are furnished by Edward Gaylord Bourne, Professor of History in Yale University, well known as an authority on early Spanish discoveries and colonization in the New World. The series will include a very careful and extensive bibliography of Philippina—the most valuable that has yet appeared. There will also be an exhaustive, analytical index to the complete series.

The selection of documents to be published in this series has been made with special reference to the social and economic conditions of the Islands under the Spanish régime, and to the history of the missions conducted therein by great religious orders of the Roman Catholic Church. The undertaking is commended by well-known scholars, librarians, and ecclesiastics, and promises to be one of the most important literary events of this decade. The work will contain many illustrations of historical importance from Spanish and other originals, from manuscripts, etc. It will further be illustrated with modern and old maps, plans of cities, views, convents, architecture, etc. It will give for the first time in the English language, the complete, original sources of our knowledge of these islands for over three centuries, and will thereby make accessible to

scholars for the first time the books and manuscripts to which we must refer to get a clear and correct view of the social, economical, political, and religious state and history of the islands. Many important and almost unknown manuscripts now published for the first time will throw much new light on present conditions and on the inner history. The sources and authorities in every case will be carefully given, and the locations of rare Philippina in libraries at home and abroad will always be stated. The text will be carefully elucidated by notes, geographic, historical, ethnological, etc., and many contributions by well-known scholars and specialists will be included.

This work is of great value and interest at the present time, when a correct knowledge of the islands is absolutely necessary, and it will contain much of interest to students of geography, ethnology, linguistics, folklore, comparative religion, ecclesiastical history, administration, etc. The economic and commercial aspects will be given due attention, and it is the intention of the editors to make the work such that it will be highly welcome to librarians who are already seriously embarrassed in trying to meet the demand, in both reference and public libraries, for information relative to our Malaysian possessions—a demand which is increasing rapidly and must continue to increase.

**Louis XVIII and the Hundred Days.**—The latest volumes of the valuable publications of the "Société d'Histoire Contemporaine" bring us the correspondence between the envoys of London and Berlin and their respective governments during the ephemeral restoration of Napoleon that ended so disastrously at Waterloo. Sir Charles Stuart's letters to Lord Castlereagh and Count von der Goltz's letters to the Prussian minister Hardenburg illustrate the hopes and anxieties of Louis XVIII during his temporary exile at Gand. They also illustrate the rigid determination of England and Prussia not to tolerate the reestablishment of a Bonaparte régime. The business-like correspondence of Stuart interests less than the more chatty newsy letters of the Prussian nobleman. ("Louis XVIII et les Cent Jours à Gand, Recueil de documents inédits," par Albert Malet, Paris, Picard, 1902, 8vo, 2 vols.)

**Historic Highways of America.**—Under the above title Arthur Butler Hulbert begins a series of fifteen volumes destined to deal with the great pathways that nature, the wild beast, the Indian, and civilized man, have made across the face of the New World. The first volume treats of the roads made by the mound-building Indians,

and of the pathways of the buffalo in its annual migrations. Other volumes will deal with Indian thoroughfares, the roads of the pioneers, historic and military roads, the great canals, and the roads of the future. Every volume will be a welcome illustration of the great historic truth that the roads of a land are the real arteries and veins of its social and political life. (Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, 1902, 8vo, pp. 140.)

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

**Meeting of the Board of Directors.**—The annual meeting of the trustees of the Catholic University was held Wednesday, Nov. 12. Those present were His High Eminence James, Cardinal Gibbons, Most Rev. John J. Williams, D.D., Archbishop of Boston; Most Rev. Patrick J. Ryan, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia; Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D., Archbishop of St. Paul; Most Rev. John J. Keane, D.D., Archbishop of Dubuque; Most Rev. John M. Farley, D.D., Archbishop of New York; Right Rev. John L. Spalding, D.D., Archbishop of Peoria; Right Rev. Camillus P. Maes, D.D., Bishop of Covington, Ky., and secretary of the board; Right Rev. John S. Foley, D.D., Bishop of Detroit; Right Rev. Ignatius F. Horstmann, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland, and Right Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D.D., Rector of the University.

Cardinal Gibbons presided. The forenoon was given to the consideration of the reports of the different committees. The Committee on Finance, of which Archbishop Williams is chairman, found the report of the Rector and Treasurer clear, full and satisfactory, and accepted the report of the auditors who had examined the assets and investments of the University. It was found that the finances are in a most satisfactory condition. During the year the receipts amounted to \$158,917.29 and the disbursements to \$155,268.73, leaving a balance of \$3,648.56. Of the amount received \$66,517.25 came from the earnings of the trust funds and other ordinary sources of revenue. There have been received in bequests during the year \$26,370.95; from sales of property, \$33,222.19; by endowments this year, \$19,465.41, and from the Bishops' Guarantee Fund, \$10,400. Eleven thousand seven hundred dollars were paid this year on the general indebtedness of the University. The gross indebtedness of the University is \$193,500; the assets on hand amount to \$59,493.10, making the net indebtedness \$134,006.90, or \$11,700 less than last year.

The Committee on Studies and Discipline, through its chairman, Bishop Horstmann, reported in commendation of the program of studies as proposed by the University, as also the reports as to discipline in Caldwell Hall and Keane Hall.

The Committee on Organization, Archbishop Ryan chairman, reported by the Rector, was approved. The appointment to the chair departments of the University. The coördination of faculties, reported by the Rector, was approved. The appointment to the chair



formerly held by the late Very Rev. Dr. Bouquillon was deferred to the April meeting. The meeting amended the by-laws of the board by voting to change the time of meeting from November to the second Wednesday after Easter.

Bishop Matthew Harkins, of Providence, R. I., was elected trustee, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Archbishop Corrigan.

The board elected the following officers: His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, president; Most Rev. Archbishop Williams, vice-president; Right Rev. Bishop Maes, secretary, and Mr. Thomas E. Waggaman, of Washington, D. C., treasurer. The Rector, Bishop Conaty, was appointed acting assistant treasurer.

There was no appointment to the vice-rectorship, the place being left open for the present. The board appointed a Committee on Investments, consisting of Cardinal Gibbons, Bishop Conaty and Mr. Michael Jenkins, of Baltimore. Dr. Joseph H. McMahon, of New York, who is assisting the Rector in the completion of the Endowment Fund, made a report which was very satisfactory. The board voted to lease a site on the University grounds for the erection of a new apostolic mission house. Several matters of importance were referred to the April meeting.

**Patronal Feast of the University.**—The Patronal Feast of the University was celebrated, as usual, on December 8. Solemn Pontifical Mass was sung by the Rector, Right Rev. Bishop Conaty. The celebrant was assisted by Rev. Wm. B. Martin, of New York; deacon, Rev. Stephen N. Moore, of Peoria; sub-deacon, Rev. Fr. Achstetter, of Baltimore, and master of ceremonies, Rev. Thomas E. McGuigan, of Baltimore. His Excellency, Most Rev. Archbishop Falconio, the new Apostolic Delegate to the United States, was present in the sanctuary in cope and mitre, assisted by Very Rev. John A. Burns, C.S.C., president of Holy Cross College, and Very Rev. Daniel Duffy, S.S., president of St. Austin's College. As this was an academic occasion the professors and students of the University wore their academic robes. Very Rev. Mgr. Rooker occupied a seat in the sanctuary. After the First Gospel Rev. D. J. Stafford, S.T.D., delivered an eloquent sermon. At the end of the Mass the Most Rev. Delegate gave the Papal Blessing.

**The New Marist College.**—On November 1, Feast of All Saints, the Rt. Rev. Rector blessed the corner-stone of the new college building in which the Marist Fathers will conduct their Apostolic School or Juniorate. It is located at Second and Savannah Streets, N. E., within easy reach of the University grounds. The plans,

which have been drawn by Mr. A. O. Von Herbulis, provide for a structure three stories high with a frontage of 131 feet and a depth of 77 feet. The style is English Gothic and the material is brick with trimmings in Indiana stone. The building will accommodate ten professors and sixty students.

**Gifts to the Library.**—Among other valuable gifts the University Library has received a copy of "Isocratidis Orationes Tres," printed at Venice "apud hæredes Petri Ravani et socios, MDLV." Though not a treasure of the earliest "cradle-period" of printing, it is still a very old and rare book. Only the Greek text is paginated. A very literal Latin translation creates the impression that the booklet was printed "ad usum discentium." The University is indebted for this valuable text to the generosity of Mr. Matthew Daly, Esq., of Brooklyn, N. Y.

**The New Apostolic Mission House.**—On the afternoon of Thursday, November 13, in the presence of a large number of visitors, professor and students of the University and surrounding colleges, His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons broke ground on the site of the New Apostolic Mission House on the grounds of the University, leased by the Missionary Union at the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees. This ceremony marks an event of national importance, and is destined to be far-reaching in its influence upon the work of the Catholic Church in this country. The ceremony occurs on the thirteenth anniversary of the opening of the University, and seems to be second only in importance to the establishment of that institution.

Among those present were: His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, Most Rev. Archbishops John J. Williams, William Henry Elder, Patrick J. Ryan, John Ireland, Alexander Christie, John J. Keane, John M. Farley, Right Rev. Bishops Camillus P. Maes, Thomas O'Gorman, Thomas J. Conaty, Monsignor Kennedy, rector of the American College, Rome, Italy; Very Rev. J. A. Zahm, C.S.C., provincial of the Holy Cross congregation; Very Rev. Fr. Deshon, C.S.P., provincial of the Paulists; Rev. Walter Elliott, C.S.P., superior of the Apostolic Mission House; Rev. A. P. Doyle, C.S.P., New York.

**Conference of the Association of American Universities.**—The third annual conference of the Association was held at Columbia University, New York City, December 29, 30 and 31, 1902. Several important papers were presented and discussed, and matters of business transacted. Dr. G. R. Parkins, President of Lower Canada College and Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the Cecil Rhodes

Scholarship Fund, appeared before the association, and gave an interesting account of the establishment of the fund and the work that is being done preliminary to the assignment of the scholarships, and expressed the desire for any advice that members of the association might be able to give. The Catholic University of America was represented by Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, S.T.D., Rector, and Daniel W. Shea, Ph.D., General Secretary. An invitation from Bishop Conaty to hold the next conference in Washington was taken under advisement by the executive committee. The Catholic University of America was made a member of the executive committee. On the evening of December 30, the association was given a banquet at Sherry's by the New York Alumni of the universities composing the association. Rev. P. H. Hayes, S.T.L., Secretary to Archbishop Farley, and President of the Catholic University of America Alumni Association, was a member of the reception committee. The University Club and the Century Club of New York very courteously extended the members of the Association of Universities the privileges of their clubs. Columbia University maintained fully its tradition for splendid hospitality.

#### Faculty of Law.

**General University Lectures.**—Of the five courses of general university lectures offered by the Faculty of Law, two have been commenced during the current term—the course on the principles and processes of oratory, and the course on religious corporations. The course on oratory has been given on Monday in the law lecture room in McMahon Hall, and has been attended by between forty and fifty students, drawn from all departments of the University and from the colleges of the religious orders. This course of lectures is auxiliary to the courses on homiletics and sacred eloquence offered in the faculty of theology, and to the course in forensics offered in the School of Law. The subjects treated in this course are: I, The Psychological Process involved in Oratory; II, The Training of the Orator; III, The Contents of an Oration; IV, The Preparation of an Oration; V, The Delivery of an Oration. The course on Religious Corporations has been delivered on Wednesdays in one of the lecture rooms in Caldwell Hall, and has been attended by thirty or more students, most of them belonging to the School of Theology. The subjects treated in this course are: I, The general law of the land concerning corporations and associations, especially those organized for the promotion of charitable and religious enterprises; II, The legal status of Catholic ecclesiastical corporations and associations in the United States, in-

cluding the relations of Church and State in each state in the Union, and the laws of each state in reference to religious bodies; III, The incidental legal rights and duties of Catholic ecclesiastical corporations and associations in the United States, with special reference to limitations upon property rights, exemptions from taxation and other public burdens, the validity of charitable devises and bequests to pious uses, etc. The first subject is now under discussion with the class by Dr. W. C. Robinson. The second will be taken up early in the winter term by Rev. Dr. Creagh. The third will follow under Dr. Robinson. The object of this course is to afford to the clergy educated at the University an opportunity to become sufficiently acquainted with the legal rights and obligations of parishes, asylums, etc.; to enable them to protect the interests committed to their charge, and to become safe advisers in matters pertaining to the business management of church affairs.

**The Decision in the Riverside Law Suit.**—Although the Faculty of Law has no greater interest in the property of the University than any other of its academic departments, the decision of the Riverside suit in favor of the University affords them a peculiar satisfaction, as confirming their unanimous opinion concerning the rights of the University in reference to this controversy. The matter is important enough to all friends of the University to receive a brief mention in these pages. In 1897 the University sold a tract of land on Riverside Drive in the City of New York, a portion of the McMahon estate, for \$100,000, giving to the purchaser an executory contract to be followed by a deed when certain payments had been made. The purchaser, having paid a small amount, erected a building on the land at an expense of upwards of \$10,000, and soon after abandoned the land, leaving the building unpaid for, and making no further payments on the purchase money. The University was compelled to take back the land and again put it on the market for sale. The contractors with the purchaser, who had erected the building, then made claims upon the University for the payment of their bills, and having placed mechanics' liens upon the land, proceeded to foreclose them in the courts of New York. Upon the trial of the case in the lower court the University was defeated, and judgment rendered against it for \$10,419.88. From this judgment the University appealed to the Appellate Division of the First Department, where the judgment below was affirmed by a divided court. From this decision another appeal was taken to the Court of Appeals, which reversed the decisions of the lower courts and by a unanimous judgment of the six judges

present at the hearing determined the suit in favor of the University. In rendering their decision the court said:

"The judgment appealed from should be reversed. The mechanics' liens involved in this action were filed against property now owned by the Catholic University of America. The appellant insists that the labor and materials furnished, for which liens were filed, were not furnished either with its consent or at its request, although its property has been held liable therefor. It is not even pretended that the university requested the performance of the labor or the furnishing of the material employed in the erection of the building upon the appellant's land. Nor do we think there was any such consent as is contemplated by the statute relating to the subject. . . . The only ground upon which the Appellate Division held that the university consented to the erection of buildings on its land is that the contract of sale effected such consent. The provision upon which that court relied as constituting consent was as follows: 'It is further understood and agreed that the vendee shall have the right of immediate possession to the property hereinbefore mentioned and described for the purpose of erecting buildings thereon.' Obviously, the only effect of that provision was to give the vendee the right of possession which he would not otherwise have had, and it cannot be regarded as a consent under the provisions of the Lien Law to the erection of the building constructed by Dexter. It is to be observed that, while there was consent by the vendor that the vendee should have the right of possession for the purpose of erecting buildings thereon, there was no consent whatever to the construction of the particular building erected. It is quite evident that the university had knowledge of the fact that the defendant Dexter intended to improve the property by the erection of a building thereon. There was, however, no proof of any knowledge upon its part as to the character of the building to be erected, of the erection of the building constructed, or that the university acquiesced therein. Proof of the existence of that knowledge was insufficient to establish a consent, under the Lien Law, to the erection of any building which the vendee should conclude to or did erect. The decision of the learned Appellate Division in that respect is in direct conflict with the later decisions of this court (*Vosseller v. Slater*, 25 App. Div., 368, 372, affirmed 163 N. Y., 564; *Havens v. West Side Elec. L. & P. Co.*, 49 N. Y. St. R., 771, affirmed 60 N. Y. St. R., 874; *Hankinson v. Vantine*, 152 N. Y., 20, 29; *De Klyn v. Gould*, 165 N. Y., 282, 286; *Rice v. Culver*, 172 N. Y., 60).

". . . This review of the authorities discloses that the consent

relied upon by the respondent was insufficient to justify the court in holding the land of the university liable to the liens sought to be enforced in this action. Therefore, there was in this case no evidence to justify the trial court in finding that the labor and materials performed and furnished by the lienors were furnished with the consent of the university.

"It thus appearing that there was no evidence which, according to any reasonable view, supports the finding of the trial court, and as the affirmance by the Appellate Division was not unanimous, the question whether there was any evidence to support that finding raises a question of law which the Court of Appeals may review (*Ostrom v. Greene*, 161 N. Y., 353).

"While there were several other questions presented upon the argument and in the briefs of counsel, still, as the judgment must be reversed upon the ground that there was no valid consent by the owner which made its land liable for the liens placed thereon, no discussion of those questions seems necessary. . . .

"The judgment should be reversed and a new trial granted."